



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06740409 9



—

THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

EDITED BY DAVID N. LORD.

VOL. V.

JULY, 1852—APRIL, 1853.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN KNIGHT.
140 NASSAU STREET.

1853.

THEOLOGICAL

257

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1853, by

DAVID N. LORD.

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York

ROBERT CRAIGHEAD, PRINTER.
53 NASSAU STREET.

358
106

THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

VOLUME V.

JULY, 1852.

NUMBER I.

ART. I.—THE THEORY ON WHICH GEOLOGISTS FOUND
THEIR DEDUCTION OF THE GREAT AGE OF THE WORLD.

BY THE EDITOR.

It was the object of the article on this subject, in our last number, to show that the geological theory of the vast age of the world is irreconcilable with the inspired history of the creation; and that the great postulates on which it proceeds, respecting a chaotic condition of the earth, an extinction of light, an annihilation of an atmosphere, an erosion of mountains, a change of the earth's axis in relation to the ecliptic, and an extermination of vegetables and animals, are unauthorized and incompatible with the principles of geology. It is our design, in the present discussion, to show that the theories respecting the mode in which the strata of the earth were formed and brought into the condition in which they now subsist, which geologists make a principal ground of their inference that immense periods must have been occupied in the process, are in like manner mistaken, and inconsistent both with the facts and with the maxims of the science.

That deduction they found,—not directly on the strata
VOL. V.—NO. I. 1

themselves, but—mainly, first, on an assumption respecting the sources whence the materials of which they consist were derived; next, on an hypothesis respecting the forces by which those materials were transported to the places of their deposition, arranged in their several combinations, and thrown into the conditions in which they now exist; and thirdly—which holds but a very subordinate place in their reasonings—on a theory respecting the production and destruction of the vegetables and animals, the relics of which are embodied in the strata.* As the facts themselves of the science are not the basis directly of their deduction of the period which they assign to the formation of the strata, but hypotheses respecting the causes and processes to which they owe their existence, those facts themselves do not demonstrate that deduction. In order to sustain it they must *prove* that the materials of the strata were drawn from the sources to which they refer them; that they were borne to their respective places, arranged in their combinations, and subjected to the modifications which they have undergone by the forces to which they ascribe those processes. If they cannot verify these hypotheses, if they are inconsistent with the facts of the science and the laws themselves of matter, then their deduction from them of the vast age of the world falls to the ground. On the other hand, the claims of that inference to be regarded as a scientific deduction will be confuted, if we simply show that the postulates

* "The whole period occupied in the deposition of the fossiliferous rocks must have been immensely long. There must have been time for water to have made depositions more than six miles in thickness, by *materials worn from previous rocks*, and more or less comminuted; time enough, also, to allow of hundreds of changes in the materials deposited, such changes as now require a long period for the production of one of them; time enough to allow of the growth and dissolution of animals and plants often of microscopic littleness, sufficient to constitute almost entire mountains of their remains; time enough to produce, by an extremely slow *change of climate*, the destruction of several nearly entire groups of organic beings; for although sudden catastrophes may have sometimes been the immediate cause of their extinction, there is reason to believe those catastrophes did not usually happen till such a change had taken place in the physical condition of the globe as to render it no longer a comfortable habitation for beings of their organization. *We must judge of the time requisite for these deposits by similar operations now in progress; and those are in general extremely slow.*"—*Hitchcock's Geology of Massachusetts*, p. 773.

from which it is drawn are merely supposititious, not demonstrated. If, in addition to that, we prove also that they are altogether irreconcilable with the facts and principles of the science, and the laws of nature, and infinitely self-contradictory, we shall furnish all the evidence that can be required to overthrow their theory; and that we propose to do.

Of the two great postulates on which they mainly found their deduction of the great age of the world, that which relates to the geological agents is, as stated in our former article, that the forces by which the strata of the earth were originally formed and subsequently modified, were those of chemistry, fire, and water, which are now acting on the globe, and producing somewhat similar effects; and that the energy with which they are now exerting their powers, and the scale on which they are giving birth to changes in the earth's surface, are to be taken as the measure of their intensity, and the rapidity with which they wrought their several effects in the formation of the strata. There is, indeed, some diversity of opinion among them in respect to this branch of the hypothesis. Thus Sir H. T. De la Beche says:—

“The two prevailing theories of the present time are—1st, That which attributes all geological phenomena to such effects [operations] of existing causes as we now witness; and 2d, That which considers them referable to a series of catastrophes, or sudden revolutions. The difference in the two theories is not in reality very great; the question being merely one of intensity of forces, so that probably by uniting the two we should approximate nearer to the truth.”—*Manual of Geology*, p. 32.

He accordingly, and all others who regard the formation of the strata as having occupied immense periods, hold that though at some few stages—as in the elevation of mountains, the dislocation of the strata, and their subsequent denudation—volcanic fires and the waters of the ocean must have acted with far greater energy than ordinary; yet that, in the main, the rate at which they are now giving birth to their several effects is to be taken as the measure of their past agency. The mode in which this theory is

advanced by them was exemplified in our former article, by a variety of passages from the leading writers. We add a few others:—

“It is only by carefully considering the combined action of all the causes of change *now in operation*, whether in the animate or inanimate world, that we can hope to explain such complicated appearances as are exhibited in the general arrangement of mineral masses.”—*Lyell's Principles*, vol. ii. p. 210.

“The geologist must on no account think it out of the bounds of his legitimate province to examine with care and interest into the history of the processes *now performed in the ocean and on land*; for it is only by discrimination and generalization of these that we can hope to draw satisfactory inferences concerning the force and direction of the agencies formerly exerted in earlier oceans, and on earlier continents.”—*Phillips's Guide*, p. 102.

“It is presumed that the reader will . . . be convinced that the forces formerly employed to remodel the crust of the earth, were the same in kind and energy as those now acting; or at least he will perceive that the opposite hypothesis is very questionable.”—*Lyell's Principles*, pref. xi.

“Moving water is the only agent known to us capable of carrying away the great collective mass of rock”—that has been swept from the mountains and hills. “In order therefore to form a just conception of the time and conditions required to produce the effects observed, we should carefully examine the latter, and estimate the transporting powers of those waters which now exist among the mountains themselves, and which transport detrital matter from the central parts outwards.”—*Sir H. T. De la Beche's Theoretical Geology*, p. 147.

“The immense period requisite to wear away such a mass of rock as this theory supposes to have once occupied the whole valley of the Connecticut, will seem to most minds the strongest objection to its adoption; I mean, *supposing it to have been effected by such causes as are operating at present*. But this is not a solitary example, in which geological phenomena indicate the operation of existing causes through periods of duration inconceivably long. We may in this case, indeed, suppose the occurrence of other agencies in the earlier periods of our globe. Still even with this aid the work must have been immensely protracted. And why should we hesitate to admit the existence of our globe through

periods as long as geological researches require!"—*Hitchcock's Geology of Massachusetts*, p. 339.

These views are advanced by a crowd of other writers. There is no element of their speculations in which they more generally agree than that the causes to which the strata owe their origin and modifications were those now in activity on the globe, and that they produced their effects by agencies in the main of only their present energy.

Their other great postulate is, that the stratified portions of the crust of the earth were formed mainly from the detritus of rocky continents and islands, and borne down to the ocean by rivers, or beat off by waves from the shores, and distributed over the bottom of the sea by tides and currents. Thus Dr. Buckland—

"Beneath the whole series of stratified rocks that appear on the surface of the globe, there probably exists a foundation of unstratified crystalline rocks, bearing an irregular surface, from the detritus of which *the materials* of stratified rocks have in great measure been derived, either directly by the accumulation of the ingredients of disintegrated granitic rocks, or indirectly by the repeated destruction of different classes of stratified rocks, the materials of which had, by prior operations, been derived from unstratified formations, amounting to a thickness of many miles. This is indeed but a small depth in comparison with the diameter of the globe; but small as it is, it affords certain evidence of a long series of changes and revolutions, affecting not only the mineral condition of the nascent surface of the earth, but attended also by important alterations in animal and vegetable life.

"The detritus of the first dry lands being drifted into the sea and there spread out into extensive beds of mud and sand and gravel, would for ever have remained beneath the surface of the water, had not other forces been subsequently employed to raise them into dry land.

"Wherever solid matter arose above the water, it became exposed to destruction by atmospheric agents; by rains, torrents, and inundations, at that time probably acting with intense violence, and washing down and spreading forth in the form of mud and sand and gravel upon the bottom of the then existing seas, the materials of primary stratified rocks, which by subsequent exposure to various

degrees of subterranean heat, became converted into beds of gneiss, and mica slate, and hornblende slate, and clay slate. In the detritus thus swept from the early lands into the most ancient seas, we view the commencement of that enormous series of derivative strata which by long continued repetition of similar processes have been accumulated to a thickness of many miles."—*Bridgewater Treatise*, pp. 42, 50, 51.

"Thus the origin of strata is derived from depositions of the materials of the dry land under the waters of the sea, and, in some cases, of great inland lakes intermixed with the spoils of animals that have lived and died through a long succession of ages. If the daily causes of waste pulverize the solid mountains, and the rivers transport their ruins to the sea, so other causes acting more extensively and powerfully, must be allowed a share in producing and depositing the materials to which we owe our present stratified rocks. The extent and nature of those operations will be fully examined in its proper place, *as they are now in progress*, or are past; and *as they include the geology which relates to the present surface of the earth*. In the ruins of an ancient earth we find the materials which form the present; as in the destruction of the land which we now inhabit nature seems to be preparing habitations for future races of animated beings.

"But though I have here said that causes operating more extensively and powerfully than the slow actions of waste and transportation may have aided in preparing the materials of the strata, we must beware of allowing more effect to these than they were capable of producing, as has been done by those who object to certain geological claims on indefinite time, and who seek for solutions in transitory diluvian powers. The effects of such torrents must have been to deposit mixed materials of various sizes in a confused manner; and they could therefore have prepared *the germs of the conglomerated strata only*. The strata formed of finer materials must have been the consequences of tedious actions, analogous to those which we daily witness; while their separation into distinct rocks, into alternations of clay and sand, producing schist and sandstone, must have equally been the work of a slow process beneath the water."—*Macculloch's Geology*, vol. i. pp. 81, 82.

"Denudation is the removal of solid matter by running water, whether by a river or marine current, and the consequent laying bare of some inferior rock. Geologists have, perhaps, been seldom in the habit of reflecting that this operation has exerted an influence

on the structure of the earth's crust as universal and important *as sedimentary deposition itself*; for denudation is the inseparable accompaniment of the production of all new strata of mechanical origin. The formation of every new deposit by the transport of sediment and pebbles necessarily implies that there has been somewhere else *a grinding down of rock into rounded fragments, sand, or mud, equal in quantity to the new strata*. All deposition therefore, except in the case of a shower of volcanic ashes, is the sign of superficial waste going on contemporaneously, and to an equal amount elsewhere. The gain at one point is no more than sufficient to balance the loss at some other.

"If then *the entire mass of stratified deposits* in the earth's crust is at once *the monument and measure of the denudation which has taken place*, on how stupendous a scale ought we to find the signs of this removal of transported materials in past ages!

"Professor Ramsay has shown that the missing beds removed from the summit of the Mendips must have been nearly a mile in thickness, and he has pointed out considerable areas in South Wales and some of the adjacent counties of England where a series of palæozoic strata not less than 11,000 feet in thickness have been stripped off. All these materials have, of course, been transported to new regions, and have entered into the composition of more modern formations. On the other hand, it is shown by observations in the same 'Survey,' that the palæozoic strata are from 20,000 to 30,000 feet thick. It is clear that such rocks, formed of mud and sand, now for the most part consolidated, are the monuments of denuding operations, which took place at a very remote period in the earth's history."—*Lyell's Manual*, pp. 66–68.

"The strata are accumulations of consolidated sand and other detritus, the sedimentary deposits of rivers and seas, combined with the durable remains of animals and plants.

"From the first moment that dry land appeared on the earth's surface, whatever may have been the materials of which it was composed, the disintegrating effects of atmospheric agents and of water in motion must have commenced. The detritus thus produced transported to the tranquil depths of the ocean, would then subside in successive layers, and a series of sedimentary strata be gradually formed; and after the creation of living things, the durable remains of animals and vegetables must have become intermingled with the detritus of the land, and imbedded in the deposits then in progress.

"If the land were sterile, destitute of vegetation, and untenanted

by any species of animals, the relics of the inhabitants of the sea would alone be imbedded ; on the contrary, if the sediments were produced by the action of streams and rivers flowing through a country covered with forests, and swarming with animal life, the strata accumulated in lakes and inland bays would teem with the remains of terrestrial and fluviatile animals and plants.”—*Mantell's Geological Principles, in his Excursion round the Isle of Wight*, pp. 56–58.

“It is universally admitted that the materials of the sedimentary strata . . . are derived from the disintegration, decomposition, and abrasion of older rocks, and from animal and vegetable secretions.”—*Mather's Geology of the first Geological District of New York*, p. 273.

They thus universally exhibit the strata as formed from detritus borne down by streams and rivers from pre-existing continents and islands and distributed over the bed of the sea.

The surface of that imagined primitive earth, instead of loose soils and strata that are easily disintegrated and borne by torrents and rivers to the sea, consisted, according to these writers, exclusively of granite, one of the most solid and indestructible of the rocks.

“Assuming that the whole materials of the globe may have once been in a fluid or even a nebular state, from the presence of intense heat, the passage of the first consolidated portions of this fluid or nebulous matter to a solid state may have been produced by the radiation of heat from its surface into space ; the gradual abstraction of such heat would allow the particles of matter to approximate and crystallize ; and the first result of this crystallization might have been the formation of a shell or crust, composed of oxidated metals and metalloids, constituting various rocks of the granitic series, around an incandescent nucleus of melted matter heavier than granite.”—*Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 40.

“That granite has in reality furnished a very large part of the materials of the recent strata, is proved by their constitution. Quartz, felspar, mica, and hornblende are the chief materials of the sandstones, shales, and clays ; nay the very fragments of that rock are found everywhere. Even in our recent alluvial soils they abound ; and it is a question worth considering whether the granite boulders, of which the immediate origin has so often been vainly

traced, are not rather the portions of decomposed conglomerate strata, or the more durable remains of the alluvial soils on which they now repose."—*Macculloch's Geology*, vol. i. p. 155.

"He who shall divest the present surface of all but its rocks, who shall exterminate from our maps the great alluvial plains and deltas of the globe, with the countless interior tracts of the same nature, will produce a sketch of the original earth in no small degree interesting. It is through decomposition and disintegration, aided by mechanical power, that these changes have been produced."—*Macculloch's Geology*, vol. ii. p. 2.

We shall have occasion in the course of the discussion to cite other passages in which the same views are presented. According to the theory, then, the continents from which the vast materials of the sedimentary strata were originally drawn, consisted throughout their whole mass of granite, and it was by the slow process of disintegration by the action of the atmosphere, heat, moisture, frost, rains, torrents, and rivers, that that generally hard and almost unyielding substance was reduced to fragments and minute particles, and transported to the sea.

The question now is, whether they have demonstrated these great postulates. It is not enough to authorize the stupendous inference they have grounded on them respecting the age of the world, and invest it with the character of a scientific deduction according "to the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy," to show that they are possibly or even probably true. They must be established by the most unanswerable evidence, in order that they can serve as a foundation for the vast fabric which is attempted to be erected on them. If they are mere suppositions, or gratuitous assumptions—if, instead of being demonstrated, they involve gross self-contradictions, and are irreconcilable alike with the laws of matter and the principles of geology, then the lofty structure which has been reared on them must be equally unsubstantial; and such we shall now proceed to show is their character.

The question which first requires consideration respects the sources from which the materials of the strata were drawn. 1. And we remark in the first place that it is a mere hypo-

thesis, not a demonstrated fact, that they were derived from continents, islands, or mountains that consisted exclusively of granite. These writers have not proved it. They do not even claim to have demonstrated it. They have taken it for granted, or advanced it simply as a supposition that furnishes in their judgment a more probable explanation than any other of the formation of the primary crust of the earth, and of the origin of the materials of the strata that were subsequently imposed on the primitive rocks. Thus Dr. Buckland says:—

“As the materials of the stratified rocks are in great degree derived directly or indirectly from those which are unstratified, it will be premature to enter upon the consideration of derivative strata until we have considered briefly the history of the primitive formations. We therefore commence our inquiry at that most ancient period, *when there is much evidence to render it PROBABLE* that the entire materials of the globe were in a fluid state, and that the cause of this fluidity was heat. . . . ASSUMING that the whole materials of the globe *may have once been* in a fluid state, from the presence of intense heat, the passage of the first consolidated portion of this fluid to a solid state *may have been* produced by the radiation of heat from the surface into space; the gradual abstraction of such heat would allow the particles of matter to approximate and crystallize; and the first result of this crystallization *might have been* the formation of a shell or crust, . . . constituting various rocks of the granitic series.”—*Bridgewater Treat.*, pp. 39, 40.

“Whence came the materials of the great mass of deposits which rest upon the primary gneiss and mica schist? *Probably* the true answer to this, *though we cannot now give adequate proof of it*, is that *the disintegration of granite and other igneous rocks*, to which—on what seem good grounds—we have already ascribed the origin of gneiss and mica schist, has been *the prolific source of all these sedimentary strata*. Analysis of the principal rocks of the slaty systems does certainly not contradict this view; which neither those who admit with Leibnitz the first solid covering of the globe to have been a mass of rocks cooled from fusion, or with Lyell that strata added above are melted and reabsorbed into granite below, have any reason to deny.”—*Phillips's Geology*, vol. i. p. 150.

This view of the primitive earth, which they make the basis of their theory of the formation of the strata and inference

of the immense age of the world, is thus merely supposititious. It is not advanced as an ascertained and indubitable fact. It is not even held to be susceptible of demonstration. An attempt to verify it by "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy" would be regarded by geologists themselves as an extravagance. In its highest character it is only a conjecture. This consideration overturns, therefore, the deduction that is founded on it respecting the long existence of the world. That conclusion cannot be established on a mere hypothesis. It cannot rise any higher in certainty than the premise from which it is drawn. To build it, moreover, on such a basis is as inconsistent with the principles of geology as it is with the laws of logic; as they—as was shown in our former article—forbid the assumption of any geological effect or condition of the earth as a ground of induction, that cannot be proved to have actually existed. The whole fancy, accordingly, of a scientific confutation by it of the inspired history of the creation, and demonstration that the earth has subsisted through a vast round of ages, is mistaken. The circumstance that the sacred narrative is at variance with an undemonstrated and undemonstrable *supposition*, is no proof that it is not consistent with fact.

2. In the next place, their theory of the formation of the granitic world, from which they represent the materials of the strata as derived, is altogether gratuitous also, and in contravention of the laws of matter. That theory is, as stated by Dr. Buckland in the passage already quoted from him, that the matter of the earth was, when created, "in a fluid" or "nebulous state;" that is, in the form of gas, "from the presence of intense heat;" and that it was by "the radiation of that heat into space" that "the particles" were allowed to approximate and crystallize. Mr. Macculloch also entertains the same view.

"The first condition of the earth which has been inferred is that of a gaseous sphere; while it is my business to state that *the only evidence for this is derived from the analogy of comets, itself rather more inferential than proved*, as far as the study of these bodies has hitherto proceeded. But it must also be said, as corroborative of such an inference, that the laws of the radiation of heat, and those of chemi-

cal combination, *do permit the needful inference* that such a sphere *might or must* finally become a fluid; or at least a fluid globe surrounded by an atmosphere.

"This, then, is the second *presumed* condition. And the evidence for such a fluid globe is found, first in its statical figure, and secondly in the various geological facts already reviewed, and founded primarily on the phenomena of volcanoes, which prove that the interior of the earth, beyond a certain depth, is at present in a fluid condition from that heat which was once sufficient for the preceding more extensive effects.*

"And here terminates that which is of most difficult investigation in the theory of the earth, and which *by many will still be ranked with hypotheses*. The evidence, *such as it is*, is given; what a rational philosophy will pronounce on it, will always deserve attention. . . .

"I know of no mode in which the surface of a fluid globe could be consolidated, but by the radiation of heat; while of the necessity of such a process I need not again speak. The immediate result of this must have been the formation of rocks on that surface: and if the interior fluid does now produce the several unstratified rocks, the first that were formed must have resembled these, if not all. We may not unsafely infer that they were granite, perceiving that substances of this character have been produced wherever the cooling appears to have been most gradual. *The first apparently solid globe was therefore a globe of granite*, or of those rocks which bear the nearest crystalline analogies to it."—*Geology*, vol. ii. pp. 416, 417.

Essentially the same views are advanced by Sir H. T. De la Beche.

But this hypothesis is altogether unphilosophical. The fusion of matter, or its existence in a gaseous form, "*from the presence of intense heat*," which is the necessary condition of its assuming that shape, is not a natural but an artificial state. It is the result of chemical action, and implies therefore a *previous existence of the matter in a different form*. The supposition that the earth was *created* in that state is a self-contradiction, therefore, and at war with the laws of matter. It might as well be supposed that the world was created with thunderstorms and earthquakes in progress, which imply

* An assumption not only without proof and against the laws of matter, but rejected by a large body of the most eminent geologists themselves.

a previous existence of the globe and atmosphere in a different state ; or with animals on the point of giving birth to offspring, which implies their previous existence. Moreover, as the heat that is evolved in the action of chemical agents on each other is always previously latent in those agents, the supposition of the fusion of the matter of the globe by the presence of intense heat, implies that that heat had previously existed in the matter of the globe in a latent state ; and that again implies that anterior to the development of that heat, that matter existed in a different form. It assumes also that an immeasurably greater quantity of latent heat existed in the matter of the globe in its original condition than now subsists in it ; and it is implied also in the supposition, that beyond that which is now latent in the earth, a quantity as much greater as would raise the whole of the substances of the globe to the most intense fusion and convert them into gas, has passed off from it by radiation into the realms of space. But that is not only wholly gratuitous and infinitely improbable, but is in contravention of the principles of geology also, which forbid the assumption of any geological condition of the earth as a basis of induction, that cannot be proved to have actually existed ; or any geological effect that cannot have resulted from the chemical and mechanical forces that are now giving birth to changes in the materials of the globe. But what can transcend the extravagance of the fancy that these forces, acting with even thousands of times their present intensity, can have held all the materials of the globe in a state of fusion ; or that all the chemical agents which it contains, in any combination that is possible, are adequate to such a stupendous effect ? By the supposition, caloric, the grand agent of the imagined fusion, has in a great degree radiated from the earth into space, so that it no longer exists here in the force that is requisite to that effect. A splendid combination of solecisms for the basis of a philosophical theory ! A magnificent platform for a scientific confutation of the record God has given of the work of creation ! How is it that these writers have overlooked a consideration so obvious, and that indicates so decisively the untenableness of their theory ?

3. But in the third place, they are not only forbidden by

the laws of matter from assuming the existence of such granitic continents, islands, and mountains as they suppose, anterior to the formation of the strata, but they are without any certainty that there were any mountains, islands, or continents whatever, that could have furnished materials in any considerable measure for such vast deposits. This is admitted by Professor Phillips.

“Whether at the time when all our continents were beneath the sea, there were other continents raised above it, is a matter which it is difficult to bring fairly within the scope of inductive science, except in a very limited form, and upon rather doubtful assumptions. *The only clear and certain evidence* of the existence of the land in other situations than where it now appears, is to be sought in the history of terrestrial organic exuviae imbedded in the earth; the only reasonable presumptive evidence in favor of such a doctrine must be founded on mechanical considerations connected with the mass and depth of the waters of the ocean. To conclude that because continents were raised in one quarter, others *must* have been depressed elsewhere in a certain proportion, is inadmissible, because it requires us to admit what is perhaps false, viz. that the spaces occupied by the solid and liquid parts of the mass of the globe have always been exactly and invariably in the same proportion to each other as at present. Who can assure us of the truth, or even the probability of such a law?”—*Guide to Geology*, p. 38

Such is undoubtedly the fact. The only certain evidence which the strata themselves can furnish of the existence of dry land at the period of their formation, is the presence in them of fossilized animals and vegetables, to the existence of which dry land was necessary. The mere fact that the strata were formed beneath the waters of the ocean is no proof that the materials of which they consist were derived from continents and mountains, any more than it is that they were not. Nor is the fact that a portion of their materials were probably or certainly drawn from such a source, any proof that they all were, any more than the fact that some of the waters of the ocean have run from mountains and continents is a proof that they all originally descended from those sources.

Mr. Lyell makes the same admission.

"If asked where the continent was placed, from the ruins of which the Wealden strata were derived, we might be almost tempted to speculate on the former existence of the Atlantis of Plato as true in geology, although fabulous as an historical event. We know that *the present European lands have come into existence almost entirely since the deposition of the chalk*; and the same period may have sufficed for the disappearance of a continent of equal magnitude situated farther west."—*Lyell's Principles*, vol. ii. p. 458.

Mr. Macculloch held that the mountains and continents from which the materials of the strata were *originally* derived, preceded those that directly furnished the elements of the present series.

"That this system had a beginning we are certain; *where that may be, we know not*; but for us it is placed beyond that era at which we can no longer trace the marks of a change of order of the destruction and renovation of its form. It is from this point that a theory of the earth must at present commence.

.

"Hence, then, I have drawn the conclusion that there was one terraqueous globe, one earth divided into sea and land, even *prior to that last named*; containing mountains to furnish and an ocean to receive those materials which formed *the second set of mountains*, whose fragments are *now* imbedded in *our primary strata*, or in those of a third order. Geologists may perhaps be startled at conclusions which they have hitherto overlooked, obvious as they are, and clear as the reasoning is: how they should not have been seen by those who have shown such anxiety to maintain the antiquity of the globe, it is not for me to explain."—*Geology*, vol. i. pp. 462, 464–466.

Yet notwithstanding this fancied proof of the existence of at least two sets of mountains and continents that were the sources, in succession, of the materials of "our primary strata," he yet acknowledges himself unable to decide whether or not those first mountains were, in a measure at least, identical with those that now exist on the globe.

"In this state of the earth the present primary strata occupied horizontal positions beneath this ocean; *though we are uncertain whether certain parts of those which we now esteem such might not*

have been the very mountains whence they were formed. This is probably the fact, however incapable we yet are of proving it, owing to our imperfect observations, and the still more imperfect views which geologists have hitherto taken of a theory of the earth. We cannot conceive that all the supra-marine land which produced the primary strata should have been mouldered and transferred to the sea before these underwent their first disturbance; nor that it should have all been depressed beneath the sea while the new-formed rocks were elevated."—Vol. i. p. 468.

This extraordinary induction scarcely merits a formal confutation. A more dim and uncertain argument could hardly be made the ground of the vast train of consequences he deduces from it. The point on which he builds his inference is altogether assumed by him, inasmuch as the existence in strata of the fragments of other rocks, is not of itself a proof that those fragments were derived from mountains, unless it is first established that the materials of such rocks cannot have been drawn from any other source; which is the precise point he was to demonstrate. This whole imagined induction, indeed, from the processes that are now taking place, is, as we shall hereafter show, a fallacy; inasmuch as the fact that minute particles and sands are borne down to the sea from the present mountains and plains, which consist in a large degree of loose soils, or sedimentary rocks that are easily disintegrated, is no evidence that similar materials and on much the same scale would have been carried down from mountains and plains that consisted exclusively of granite. The supposition is a solecism, as it implies that the same causes, though acting on different materials and in different conditions, would nevertheless produce precisely the same effects.

Other writers regard the mountains and continents from which the strata were derived as no longer in existence.

"However incomprehensible it may appear to those who have not studied the subject, geologists entertain no doubt that all our present mountains, *composed of sedimentary matter*, were accumulated *beneath the sea* during countless ages; and, if so, other continents must have existed to furnish materials, though no traces of such lands now remain."—*Sir R. I. Murchison's Silurian System*, p. 573.

"It is universally acknowledged among geologists that these immense sedimentary deposits could only have accumulated beneath the waters of the ocean during an incalculable period of time, long anterior to the present condition of the surface. Now, in order to furnish materials for such formations, *we must conceive of the existence of continents where no vestige of them now remains; from the abrasion and destruction of these*, and from the transporting power of river and ocean currents, the materials composing them were reduced to the state of pebbles, sand, and finely comminuted mud, which were widely diffused, and gradually or rapidly precipitated upon the ocean bed."—*Hall's Geology of Western New York*, p. 521.

If no trace of those continents now remains, it is plainly impossible, from the mere strata themselves, to demonstrate that they were in such positions and consisted of such elements that they can have furnished the materials from which the strata were formed. It is only by assuming the point to be proved, that all sedimentary strata must have been formed of materials derived from pre-existing mountains and dry land, that such a conclusion can be obtained. Discard that assumption, and let the question to be determined be, whether the materials of stratified rocks must necessarily be derived by disintegration and transportation from granitic continents and mountains, and the error of their argument is apparent; as it is on the assumption that that must be their origin that their whole theory is founded.

Some geologists seem to suppose that a large share at least of those materials were derived from the mountains that now subsist on the globe. But it is shown to be erroneous by the fact that all the great ranges, and most of every subordinate class, have been thrown up from beneath the ocean since the formation of the tertiary, the last great division of the strata.*

"If we date the age of granite from the period of the elevation of granite mountains we must admit that some granite mountains are comparatively recent, for they have been elevated since the deposition of the secondary strata. I have shown this to be the case with the Bernese and Savoy Alps in my *Travels* published in 1827. In the edition of the present work in 1828, I have shown also, by a description and sections, that the elevation of the granite of Savoy is more recent than that of the central part of England. M. Elie de Beaumont has since adopted the same views, and has extended

"If we admit that the primary, the transition, the secondary, and the tertiary classes of rock were formed at different successive epochs, and that the lower beds in each of these classes are more ancient than the beds that rest upon them, it follows as a necessary consequence that the elevation of any of these rocks must be dated from a later epoch than the period of their formation. The elevation of a range of primary or transition mountains, if they are not covered by any secondary or tertiary formations, may indeed be dated either from an epoch coeval with their consolidation, or from any subsequent epoch; but if they are partly covered by secondary or tertiary beds which are tilted up with them, we have direct evidence that the date of their elevation was posterior to the secondary or tertiary epoch."—*Bakewell's Geology*, p. 101.

"It is a general law, confirmed by most ample evidence, that the interior parts of mountainous regions consist of granite and other pyrogenous rocks rising from below all the strata, and bearing them up to their present elevations. From these elevated points and lines, both the subjacent igneous and the superior stratified rocks descend at various angles towards the plains and more level regions, beneath which they sink and pass at various distances until they again emerge in some other mountain group having similar characters. In consequence of this arrangement, it happens generally that the oldest strata, those which sink deepest under the plains, rise highest against the mountain slopes. . . . The most constant of all the facts connected with this part of the subject, is the development of granitic or some other pyrogenous rocks about the centres of the elevated groups from beneath all the strata there occurring."—*Phillips's Guide*, p. 31.

"Etna would appear to have been the seat of volcanic action through a long series of ages, commencing with the supercretaceous rocks, on which much of the igneous mass is now based.

"In central France, amid the extinct volcanoes which there constitute such a remarkable feature in the physical geography of the country, we certainly approach relative dates in some instances. Thus the volcanic mass of the Plomb du Cantal appears to have

them to other mountain ranges. Professor Sedgwick and Mr. Murchison have further proved that a part of the Tyrolean and Bavarian Alps was elevated since the deposition of tertiary strata; for these strata are lifted up with them to the height of several thousand feet."—*Bakewell's Geology*, p. 101. :

burst through, to have upset, and to have fractured the fresh water limestones of the Cantal, which, according to Messrs. Lyell and Murchison, may be equivalent to the fresh-water deposits of the Paris basin, and to those of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

"With regard to the igneous rocks of Auvergne, MM. Croiset and Jobert consider that there are about thirty beds above the fresh-water limestone, which may be divided into four alternations of *alluvial* detritus and basaltic deposits. Among the beds there are three which contain organic remains; two belonging to the third of the ancient alluvions, that which succeeded the second epoch of volcanic eruptions; the third fossiliferous deposit being referable to the last epoch of ancient alluvion.

"The principal ossiferous bed is about nine or ten feet thick, and can be traced a considerable distance. . . . The fossil species, according to MM. C. and S., are very numerous, consisting of Elephant, Mastodon, Hippopotamus, Rhinoceros, Tapir, Horse, Boar, Felis, Hyæna, Bear, Canis, Castor, Hare, Water Rat, Deer, and Ox."—*H. T. De la Beche's Manual*, pp. 241, 242.

"The same phenomena are exhibited in the Alps on a much grander scale; those mountains being composed, in some even of their higher regions, of newer secondary formations, while they are encircled by a great zone of tertiary rocks of different ages, both on their southern flanks towards the plains of the Po, and on the side of Switzerland and Austria, and at their eastern termination towards Styria and Hungary. This tertiary zone marks the position of former seas or gulfs, like the Adriatic, which were many thousand feet deep, and wherein masses of strata accumulated, some single groups of which seem scarcely inferior in thickness to the whole of our secondary formations in England. These marine tertiary strata have been raised to the height of from 2000 to 4000 feet, and consist of formations of different ages, characterized by different assemblages of organized fossils. *The older tertiary groups generally rise to the greatest heights, and form interior zones nearest to the central ridges of the Alps.* Although we have not yet ascertained the number of different periods at which the Alps gained accessions to their height and width, yet we can affirm that the last series of movements occurred when the seas were inhabited by *many existing species of animals.*

"The Pyrenees also have acquired the whole of their present altitude, which in Mount Perdu exceeds 11,000 feet, since the deposition of some of the newer or cretaceous members of our secondary series."—*Lyell's Principles*, vol. i. p. 139.

There are similar proofs, also, of the elevation from the ocean of the other great ranges of Europe and Asia since the formation of the secondary strata.

The great mountains of this continent, also, the Appalachians and Andes, are now universally regarded as having been thrown up from the ocean since the period of the secondary formations. The Appalachians bear on their tops or sustain on their sides the main members of the great series from the Potsdam sandstone, the lowest of the fossiliferous rocks on this continent, up to the upper division of the carboniferous group. Deposits of equally late date are found also in the lofty ranges of the Andes.

"I will give a brief sketch of the geology of the several parallel lines forming the Cordillera. Of these lines there are two considerably higher than the others; namely, on the Chilian side, the Peuquenes ridge, which, where the road crosses it, is 13,210 feet above the sea; and the Portillo ridge on the Mendoza side, which is 14,305 feet. The lower beds of the Peuquenes ridge, and of the several great lines to the westward of it, are composed of a vast pile many thousand feet in thickness of porphyries, which have flowed as submarine lava, alternating with angular and rounded fragments of the same rocks, thrown out of the submarine craters. These alternating masses are covered in the central parts by a great thickness of *red sandstone, conglomerate, and calcareous clay slate*, associated with and passing into prodigious beds of *gypsum*. In these upper beds *shells are tolerably frequent*; and they belong to about the period of the *lower chalk of Europe*. It is an old story, but not the less wonderful, to hear of shells which were once crawling in the bottom of the sea, now standing nearly 14,000 feet above its level. The lower beds in this great pile of strata have been dislocated, baked, crystallized, and almost blended together, through the agency of mountain masses of a peculiar white soda-granitic rock.

"The other main line, namely that of the Portillo, is of a totally different formation; it consists chiefly of grand bare pinnacles of a red potash-granite, which low down on the western flank are covered by a *sandstone*, converted by the former heat into a quartz-rock. On the quartz there rest beds of a *conglomerate* several thousand feet in thickness, which have been upheaved by the red granite, and dip at an angle of 45° towards the Peuquenes line. I was astonished to find that this conglomerate was partly composed of

pebbles derived from the rocks, with *their fossil shells* of the Peuquenes range, and partly of red potash-granite, like that of Portillo. Hence we must conclude that both the Peuquenes and Portillo ranges were partially upheaved and exposed to wear and tear, when the conglomerate was forming." . . .

"Looking at its earliest origin, the red granite seems to have been injected on an ancient pre-existing line of white granite and mica slate. In most parts, perhaps in all parts of the Cordilleras, it may be concluded that each line has been formed by repeated upheavals and injections; and that the several parallel lines are of different ages. Only thus can we gain time at all sufficient to explain the truly astonishing amount of denudation which these great, *though comparatively with most other ranges recent, mountains* have suffered.

"The shells in the Peuquenes, or oldest ridge, prove, as before remarked, that it has been upraised 14,000 feet since a *secondary period*, which in Europe we are accustomed to consider as *far from ancient*; but since these shells lived in a moderately deep sea, it can be shown that the area now occupied by the Cordillera must have subsided several thousand feet—in northern Chili as much as 6000 feet—so as to have allowed that amount of submarine strata to have been heaped on the bed on which the shells lived."—*Darwin's Voyage of the Beagle*, pp. 319–321.

"The Uspallata range is separated from the main Cordillera by a long narrow plain, or basin, like those so often mentioned in Chili, but higher, being six thousand feet above the sea. This range has nearly the same geographical position with respect to the Cordillera which the gigantic Portillo line has, but it is of a totally different origin; it consists of various kinds of submarine lava, alternating with volcanic sandstones and other remarkable sedimentary deposits; the whole having a very close resemblance to some of the *tertiary beds on the shores of the Pacific*. From this resemblance I expected to find *silicified wood*, which is generally *characteristic of those formations*. I was gratified in a very extraordinary manner. In the central part of the range, at an elevation of about 7000 feet, I observed on a bare slope some snow-white projecting columns; these were petrified trees, eleven being silicified, and from thirty to forty converted into coarsely-crystallized white calcareous spar. They were abruptly broken off, the upright stumps projecting a few feet above the ground. The trunks measured from three to five feet each in circumference. They stood a little way apart from each other, but the whole formed one group. Mr. R. Brown, who has

examined the wood, says it belongs to the fir tribe, partaking of the character of the Araucanian family, but with some curious points of affinity with the yew. The volcanic sandstone in which the trees were imbedded, and from the lower part of which they must have sprung, had accumulated in successive thin layers around their trunks; and the stone yet retained the impression of the bark."—*Darwin's Voyage of the Beagle*, pp. 331, 332.

All the great ranges are thus of recent origin, and though there are mountains—generally of inferior height, and consisting mainly of granite—that were elevated at an earlier period, yet none are known that can, with any probability, be regarded as having emerged from the ocean anterior to the formation of the lower groups of the strata.

"No truth is more certain or important in geological reasoning, than the formation of all our continents and islands by causes acting below the sea. As far as relates to the stratified rocks this is obvious; but it is not the less certain for the unstratified rocks, *those having undoubtedly been uplifted to our view from beneath the strata*. It is possible there may yet be found some granite rocks which were raised above the general spherical surface before the production of any deposits from water, and which therefore may be presumed to form an exception to this general rule; but such truly primitive rocks have nowhere been seen, nor is there any ground of expectation that they will be discovered."—*Phillips's Geology*, vol. ii. p. 248.

As the most ancient of our present mountains are thus of later date than the primary strata, and all the principal ranges—like the Alps, the Himalaya, and the Andes—were elevated subsequently to the deposition of the secondary, and even portions of the tertiary formations, we have the most decisive evidence that they were not the sources of the materials from which the strata were formed. If their materials were derived from mountains and continents, it must have been from a different set, of which neither any traces remain, nor any indications of the positions which they occupied.

This consideration is thus again fatal to their theory. No condition can be more indispensable to its establishment, than that it should be shown that contemporaneously

with the deposition of the strata, there were continents and mountains in existence that might have furnished materials for their formation; and in order to that, their position should be determined and their dimensions and elevation proved to be such as rendered them adequate to the office that is assigned them. To admit that no vestiges of them remain, and that there are no means even of determining where they were stationed, is to admit that the induction that is founded on them is supposititious also and without authority. This branch of their scheme is thus inconsistent also with the principles of geology, which prohibit the assumption of any condition of the earth as a basis of induction, which cannot be proved to have truly existed.

4. Let us, however, suppose that precisely such continents as they contemplate were in existence, and situated in positions the most favorable for the office they assign them; and in place of relieving their theory from embarrassment, it only renders its error more apparent.

The average elevation of the present continents and islands above the ocean is but a few hundred feet. Lake Superior is estimated to be about six hundred and forty feet only above that level. Were all those portions therefore of the mountains and high lands of the continent north of the equator that are above the surface of that lake, removed and spread over those parts that are below it, they would undoubtedly be altogether inadequate to raise them to the same height above the sea. On the other hand, the strata of the continents are estimated by geologists to be on an average not less than six, seven, and perhaps even a greater number of miles in depth. Were they removed therefore and thrown into the ocean, the granitic basis on which they now rest, would be on an average at almost an equal depth beneath the surface of the sea. It is implied accordingly that the imagined continents from which the materials of those strata are supposed to have been drawn, were elevated a corresponding height above the ocean. This is distinctly indicated by Macculloch.

“ The immense deposits of materials which now form the alluvial tracts of the globe, the enormous masses of secondary strata which have been produced by ancient materials of the same nature, all

prove the magnitude of the destruction which mountains have formerly experienced, which they are now daily undergoing. Let imagination replace the plains of Hindostan on the Himalya, or rebuild the mountains which furnished the secondary strata of England, and it needs not be asked what is the extent of ruin, modern or ancient. In this ruin the highest rocks participate most largely; so largely that we can scarcely hope to find one portion of that surface which was once most elevated above the waters. If in the progress of such extensive destruction, thus probably acting on the primary rocks at two distinct periods, every vestige of overflowing granite has disappeared, it is assuredly an event not calculated to excite surprise."—*Geology*, vol. i. p. 154.

He here speaks as though those deposits were drawn from the present mountains of the globe; that, however, is inconsistent with the views we have quoted from him on another page, and is erroneous, as is shown by the proofs we have adduced, that the elevation of our present mountains took place mainly since the formation of the principal strata. His exemplification, nevertheless, serves to indicate the extraordinary height which the theory ascribes to those imagined continents. The super-position upon England of a mass of granite mountains in height as many miles within a fraction above the present surface, as the under surface of the lowest of its stratified rocks is below that line, which is reckoned at an average of seven, eight, or even ten miles, would give the elevation which the corresponding portion of the supposed granite continent or island must have possessed in order to have furnished the materials of those strata. The only deduction required is that of the average of the present surface above the level of the ocean, which is but a few hundred feet. The height of the imagined continent or island must accordingly have been far greater than of the loftiest present mountains of the earth, or at least six, seven, or eight miles.

On the other hand, on the supposition on which he here seems to proceed, that the materials of the strata were derived from the present mountains, the bases of which they surround, then the super-position on the Himalaya and the table lands on which they rest, of an equal area of the strata of the plains of Hindostan, would give the height

which those mountains must, according to the theory, originally have possessed ; which, if those strata are on an average like those of England, six, seven, or eight miles in depth, would raise that mountain range to the height of eleven, twelve, or thirteen miles.

Making the most moderate estimate, therefore, of those supposed continents and islands, they must have soared to a height immensely above the loftiest summits of those that are now on the earth. Their existence is, accordingly, wholly incredible, and would have altogether precluded the effect which they are employed to explain. For their whole surface must have towered to such a distance within the regions of perpetual congelation as to have been buried to a vast depth in snow, and rendered it impossible that any considerable streams should have flowed from them to bear their loosened particles and broken fragments into the surrounding sea. No condition can be imagined presenting a more absolute barrier to their disintegration and transference to a distant scene. No animals or vegetables could have lived on such frozen lands ; and probably no such warmth could have been communicated by the sun to the sea as to have fitted it for the existence of animals like those that are buried in the strata. What an extraordinary conception of the methods taken by the Almighty Creator to prepare the world for the residence of man ! Where in the annals of crude and thoughtless speculation can a more absurd and monstrous extravagance be found ?

5. Not to insist, however, on this embarrassing condition of their theory ; let us suppose that those fabulous continents and islands were not of such an incredible and fatal elevation, but only of the height of our present continents, and were diversified like them in their surfaces, and they must still have been wholly unsuited to the purpose for which geologists invent them ; for, consisting exclusively of granite, there could not have been any permanent rivers on them like those of the present earth, by which their detritus could have been borne down to the ocean. No matter how much rain fell, no springs like those that form our rivers could have risen from their surface ; inasmuch as a soil that is permeable by water, strata, and strata that are at an angle with the horizon, are indispensable conditions to the exist-

ence of such springs. The supposition of water rising through unstratified rocks by the force of gravity is a solecism. It is only by volcanic forces that water is thrown up from beneath the unstratified rocks. Without soils and strata, therefore, by which rains could be absorbed as they fell, and thence gradually drained again, there could be no permanent rivers like those which now bear a tide of earthy and vegetable matter from the hills and plains to the seas. From such a vast floor of impermeable granite the waters, wherever there was a descent, would have run as they fell, and the rivulets and streams to which they gave rise, vanished on the discontinuance of rain. The rains of a monsoon on ranges like the Andes, the Himalaya, or the mountains of Abyssinia, instead of saturating the surface with a mass of water, which, slowly emerging again, should supply permanent streams like the Amazon and Orinoco, the Ganges and Indus, the Nile and Niger, that roll without intermission to the sea, would have swept to the ocean with the rapidity of torrents, and immediately left their channels dry, till renewed by the return of another season of storms. But such torrents and floods acting on the surface only at intervals, or during a few days of the year, could never have disintegrated such granitic masses and borne their ruins to the ocean on a scale at all commensurate to the representations of the theory. Myriads of ages would have been almost as inadequate to such a process as so many days or hours. The cause, through whatever period continued, would have been wholly unequal to the effect.

This consideration, which again evinces the error of their views, has been altogether overlooked by geologists. Notwithstanding they so expressly represent the continents to which they refer the materials of the strata as consisting exclusively of granite, they in fact treat them, in most of their reasonings, as though they were covered, like the present mountains and plains, with vast masses of loose earths and easily disintegrated strata, that were everywhere moistened by rains and traversed by streams and rivers, and they found their estimate of the rates at which the strata were deposited *on the quantities of matter that are now borne down the great rivers to the sea*, and deposited in the deltas at their mouths.

But the present action of rains and rivers on the soil and strata can only be taken as a measure of their agency at former periods on surfaces of the same kinds. It is no criterion of the action of similar volumes of water on continents composed exclusively of granite, from which the strata of the present are held to be derived. To reason thus, from one world to another of a wholly different nature, is an extraordinary method of establishing a scientific induction according to "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy." Nearly the whole of their reasoning, accordingly, on this topic is irrelevant and deceptive.

They have thus had the misfortune to unite a singular complication of impracticable conditions in their theory; first selecting as the only source from which the materials of the strata were derived, continents and islands of granite that, from its solid and impervious nature, is generally almost insusceptible of disintegration by the most powerful agents that act on it; next, elevating those indestructible mountains to such a stupendous height that not a drop of water could ever descend on them, except in a state of the intensest congelation, nor a particle of the vast masses of snow, in which they must have become enveloped, ever melted, so as to exert its disintegrating power on their surface; and finally, employing only occasional and insufficient agents to exert a destroying force on their unyielding masses, and only occasional and transient agents to bear the slight spoils that might have been drawn from them to the distant sea! Admirable architects truly of the world! Who can wonder at the haughty disdain with which so many of them are accustomed to repel the criticism of their theory by any except of their own profession, as an infringement of their rights and an impeachment of their infallibility!

6. But let us suppose that the chemical and mechanical agents that may be presumed to have acted on those rocky continents would have rapidly disintegrated their surface, and reduced them on a vast scale to such minute particles as could have been transported by streams to the sea, and their theory still continues embarrassed with equally insurmountable difficulties. For they proceed in it on the assumption, first, that their whole mass would, during the progress of the process, be converted into detritus; and next, that every

particle of the detritus produced from them would be borne to the sea, and enter into the composition of the strata; as otherwise they must have been of a still more enormous height than that which is assigned to them. As the bulk, which we have indicated as ascribed to them by the theory, is only equal to that of the strata which are held to have been formed from them, if but one third, one half, or three quarters of their mass is supposed to have been transferred to the sea, then they must have been of a still greater bulk, in order that that proportion may correspond to the dimensions of the strata that are held to have been built out of their ruins. But neither of those conditions is consistent with the laws that govern the disintegration of mountains and the transportation of their detritus to the ocean. Let us, in the first place, suppose the surface of those imagined continents to have become disintegrated to such a depth that the fragments and levigated particles, if spread out on the bottom of the ocean, would have formed a stratum of several feet in thickness; and yet no known or conceivable agency of streams, torrents, and rivers could have ever conveyed the whole, or any considerable portion of them, to the sea. The supposition is as inadmissible and preposterous as the fancy were that the rivulets and streams now running, can ever bear to the ocean all the comminuted dust, sand, and gravel with which our present continents and islands are overspread. So far from achieving such a stupendous result, they would never have made any more appreciable progress towards it than our present rivers have made in reducing the elevation of the continents and diminishing the quantity of dry land. If they were shaped, like the continents of this hemisphere, with a vast range of mountains running through their whole length along their western verge, so that no rains could have fallen on their western slope to bear their debris on that side to the ocean; and if from the foot of that range on the east they were spread out like the vast regions of South America, that are traversed by the La Plata, the Amazon, and the Orinoco, and the immense plains and prairies drained in this division of the continent by the Mississippi, the St. Lawrence, and the Makenzie, it is obvious that their detritus could never in any great quantity have been transported to the ocean. Ninety-

nine parts out of a hundred—probably nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand—would for ever have remained where they fell, as the materials that constitute the surface of our present continents have continued where they were first formed. The rivulets and rivers that are of sufficient force to bear particles of earth and sand from their places towards the sea, probably do not come in contact even with one particle in millions of those that constitute the soils and debris that are spread on the surface. They act only on the narrow line of their channels, which, compared to the whole area, are but what the lines of longitude marked on an artificial globe are to the spaces that lie between them. If the supposed continents were formed like Europe, with a few lofty ranges, from the bases of which vast plains extended like those of the Po, the Rhine, and the Danube, or immense levels like those that stretch from the Baltic to the Ural Mountains, and the steppes of northern Asia, then also a great share of their detritus must for ever have remained where it originated; and that would have been still more emphatically the fact, if, like Australia, their interior through vast spaces was depressed below the level of their coasts, so that the waters falling on them could have no outlet to the ocean. Whatever might have been their forms, therefore, if they corresponded in any considerable measure to those of our present continents, the transportation of any large quantity of detritus from their general surface by torrents and rivers must have been wholly impossible. We have in the vast experiment that has been made on our present continents for four thousand years, the most ample demonstration that streams and rivers are altogether inadequate to such an effect. Were all the detrital matter that has in that period been borne by them from the dry land, and now lies buried beneath the seas, restored to the places from which it was removed, the largest portion of it would undoubtedly be lodged along the line of the streams. The share that nine tenths of the surface would receive would scarcely be appreciable.

And next, the conversion of the whole mass of those granite continents into detritus—the other condition of their theory—would be equally impossible. For the rate of disintegration and the area on which it took place, instead of

advancing or continuing the same, would continually decrease in proportion as the detritus accumulated on the surface and protected it from the action of destructive chemical and mechanical agents. A thin layer of loam, sand, or gravel would have been a shield against the decrystallizing action of the atmosphere and erosion by water. This is shown by the fact that granite rocks that have been cut and scored by the passage over them, as it is supposed, of icebergs armed with boulders, and afterwards buried by drift, on the removal of the soil with which they have been covered, exhibit no indications of having undergone disintegration after they had received those marks. Many of those, indeed, that have been exposed to the action of the elements appear unaltered. The grooves ploughed across them are as smooth and well defined as they can be believed to have been when first made.

It is shown also by the failure of the most powerful streams to produce any important change on the height or form of the granite rocks over which they have run for thousands of years. Let any one examine the granite rocks that in many places lie at the bottom of the rapid streams of New England, and form the dykes over which they fall, and he will find them generally free from any marks of disintegration or erosion by the grinding of sand, pebbles, or ice. The cavities that are cut where the water rushes down rapids or over falls, are caused by the whirl of gravel and pebbles in depressions, not by the mere passage of the stream. This is indicated by Humboldt in respect to the great cataracts of the Orinoco, formed by granite dykes, that have not been worn away, he represents, in any perceptible measure by the rush of that vast volume of water.

“ When seated on the bank of the Oroonoko, our eyes are fixed on those rocky dykes, the mind inquires whether, in the lapse of ages, the falls change their form or height. I am not much inclined to believe in such effects of the shock of water against blocks of granite and in the erosion of siliceous matter. The holes narrowed towards the bottom, the funnels that are discovered in the *raudales*, as well as near so many other cascades in Europe, are owing only to the friction of the sand and the movement of quartz pebbles. . . .

“ We will not deny the action of rivers and running waters when

they furrow friable ground covered with secondary formations. But the granite rocks of Elephantine have probably no more changed their absolute height during thousands of years than the summits of Mont Blanc and of Canigou. When you have closely inspected the great scenes of nature in different climates, it is impossible not to admit that those deep clefts, those strata raised on end, those scattered blocks, those traces of a general convulsion, are the results of extraordinary causes, very different from those which act slowly on the surface of the globe in its present state of tranquillity and repose. What the waters carry away from the granite by erosion, what the humid atmosphere destroys by its contact with hard and undecomposed rocks, almost wholly escapes our perception; and I cannot believe, as some geologists admit, that the granitic summits of the Alps and the Pyrenees lower in proportion to the accumulation of pebbles in the gullies at the foot of the mountains. In the Nile, as well as in the Oronoko, the rapids may diminish their fall, without the rocky dykes being perceptibly altered."—*Humboldt's Narrative*, vol. v. pp. 62, 64, 65.

The supposition, then, that such granitic continents could ever be disintegrated and transported to the ocean by the chemical and mechanical agents that are now acting on the surface of the earth, is altogether untenable. Such indestructible masses stretched along the line of the ancient seas could no more have furnished the materials of our strata than though they had been stationed in another world. Geologists themselves could never have advanced such an hypothesis had they properly considered the impracticable conditions it involves.

7. Admitting, however, that those imagined continents of granite could have been disintegrated by the chemical and mechanical agents to which they would have been subjected, and the theory is still embarrassed by the equally fatal objection, that they would not even then have furnished the materials of the stratified rocks; inasmuch as some of the most important of the mineral substances that enter into their composition are not constituents of granite, except in quantities almost too slight to be appreciable.

Granite is composed either of quartz, felspar, and mica, or quartz, felspar, and hornblende; and usually in the proportion of two parts of quartz, two or three of felspar, and one of mica, or hornblende; and consists, when mica is an ele-

ment, of 74 to 75 per cent. of silica, 13 to 14 of alumina, 8 or 9 of potash; and four or five other ingredients, amounting together to the remaining four or five per cent. The quantity of lime is less than half of one per cent., and of iron, less than two. When hornblende is an element, the potash is diminished one half, the lime increases to near five per cent., and the iron to near three; and these elements are not promiscuously blended, but the quartz, felspar, and mica, or hornblende, are separately crystallized and united in that form in a compact mass.* On the supposition, then, that such mountains and continents of granite could have been decrystallized and transferred to the bed of the ocean, they could not have contributed to the formation of any strata except those of which silica and alumina are the constituents; that is, gneiss, quartz rock, sandstones, shales, and sand and gravel. They could have furnished nothing, except on a scale too insignificant to merit consideration, towards the structure of the vast beds of limestone, iron, chalk, salt, and several other important deposits.

The theory thus fails again to fill the office for which it is devised, and on a vast scale. Grant them all that it can yield, exhaust its utmost resources, and instead of supplying, as it professes, the whole of the materials of which the strata are constituted, it can only furnish from one half to two thirds. How fatal to their system this defect is, is seen from the fact that limestone, to the formation of which it could contribute nothing, occurs among the lowest of the stratified rocks, and alternates either with sandstones, shales, or coal, throughout the whole series of the primary, secondary, and tertiary groups, extends over immense areas, and is often of great depth.

"One of the most remarkable geological features of this continent is the vast extent of the carboniferous limestone. I have traced its eastern border—conforming to the course of the other mineral formations east of the Mississippi—more than one thousand miles running to the west of south, from the State of New York to the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude in the State of Alabama; the course is there changed, and lies to the north of west, leaving Little

* Phillips's *Geology*, vol. ii. pp. 65, 66.

Rock on the Arkansas about thirty miles to the south, and disappearing between five and six hundred miles from the Rocky Mountains. This deposit extends uninterruptedly a geographical distance of at least 1500 miles from east to west; underlying portions of the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and the Territory of Arkansas on that line. In Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and Maryland, it is bounded by a line of which the Cumberland Mountains form a part. In the plains through which the Mississippi flows, and which include the Illinois prairies, it appears like a continuous floor, forming an almost unvarying flat."—*Featherstonhaugh's Geological Report*, 1835, pp. 27–28.

Of the aggregate of the several layers in the carboniferous group, the following section of the upper coal series in Western Virginia may be taken as an example:—

" First or lower bed, . . .	12 feet 0 inches.
Second, " . . .	6 " 4 "
Third, " . . .	3 " 0 "
Fourth, " . . .	1 " 6 "
Fifth, " . . .	6 " 6 "
Sixth, " . . .	2 " 0 "
Seventh, " . . .	7 " 6 "
Eighth, " . . .	7 " 0 "
Ninth, " . . .	5 " 0 "
<hr/>	
	50 " 10 "

Making a total thickness of limestone in this group along the line of section of fifty feet; adding to these twenty-four in the lower shale and sandstone group, and three in the lower coal group, and we have in the whole extent of the coal measures embraced in the section, a thickness of about seventy-seven feet of limestone."—*Rodgers's Report on the Geology of Virginia*, 1839, p. 93.

The inadequacy of their theory to account for this important portion of the strata, though seen and acknowledged by geologists, has not led them either to abandon or modify it. Some candidly confess themselves unable to give a satisfactory explanation of its origin; while Macculloch, Phillips, and some others, maintain, as the most probable hypothesis, that it was formed of the exuviae of testaceous animals, and was drawn originally by them from the

waters of the sea. But that, besides being a mere conjecture and infinitely improbable, furnishes no indication of its original source; as it implies either that the lime was previously held in solution in the waters of the sea—which was impossible, as the quantity is such as would have thickened all the waters of the globe to a paste—or else that it was gradually introduced into them from some unknown source, which is no explanation whatever of its origin. Instead therefore of demonstrating their hypothesis that the whole of the materials of the strata were drawn from their fabled mountains of granite, by their own concession that large portion of them that consists of limestone was of a different derivation. Those vast formations, accordingly, interspersed through the whole mass of the strata, are so many monuments of the error of their theory.

Iron, also, which enters very largely into the composition of many of the strata, especially of the carboniferous groups, cannot have resulted from the decomposition of granite, but must have been altogether drawn from some other source. Besides, indeed, those rocks which imbed it in masses and derive from it their principal character, it exists in ordinary sandstones, and shales consisting mainly, like granite, of silica and alumine, in far greater portions than in that rock.

So, also—to say nothing of chalk—of the vast beds of salt. The nature of that mineral forbids the supposition that it can have resulted from the disintegration of granite; as there is no such element in its composition.

Their theory thus fails to make any provision for the formation of at least one third of the strata for which it professes to account by a scientific induction according to “the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy.” Can higher evidence be asked of its utter erroneousness? Yet its authors, though aware that it is thus incommensurate to the vast task which they assign to it, seem not to regard its failure on so immense a scale as a proof of its inaccuracy, or reason for its abandonment. They continue to make it the basis of their arguments for the vast age of the world, and treat the inference they found on it as a scientific induction.

Unfortunately, however, for the theory, this defect does not terminate at that point. It, in fact, fails as entirely to account for those strata of which siliceous sand is the prin-

cial element, as for those which consist of limestone, iron, and salt; for though the main materials of sandstone are those of which granite consists, silica and alumine, yet the form in which they now exist demonstrates that they cannot have been derived from that rock. In granite those elements, with a slight mixture of potash, iron, and lime, are combined in three different proportions in *crystals* of quartz, felspar, and mica, or hornblende; but in sandstone they are not in the form of quartz, felspar, and hornblende, or mica crystals, as the first three would undoubtedly have been, at least in a chief degree, had they been drawn from granite. Nor are they crystallized; but instead, are, at least, mainly of a mere granular structure, or formed by an aggregation of particles by a law essentially unlike that of crystallization. The nature and importance of the distinction in structure and forms that exists between them—the crystals of granite being geometric, though imperfect, but the particles of sandstone generally simple grains or comminuted mud—may be seen from the following passage:—

“Quartz is *crystallized in double six-sided pyramids* in the substance of granitic, porphyritic, and other igneous rocks; in *six-sided prisms terminated by six-sided pyramids* in mineral veins and in cavities in granite; *compact* in veins; *nodular* in amygdaloidal traps; *rolled masses* in old red conglomerate, millstone grit, and grauwacke; *worn grains* in sandstones, clays, certain quartz rocks, and coarse clay slates.

“Feldspar; primary *rhomboidal crystals* in granite, porphyry, trachyte, and basalt; composite crystals in cavities of granite and veins; *disturbed* crystals in gneiss; *rolled* crystals in conglomerate; *decomposed or porcelain clay* in some granites and sandstones.

“Mica, *crystallized in hexagonal plates* in granite, porphyry, lava, and primary limestone; *disturbed* crystals in gneiss and mica schist; *fragmentary scales* in sandstone, sand, shale, and clay.

“Hornblende, crystallized with felspar in granite, greenstone, basalt, and lava, also in hornblende slate.”—*Phillips's Guide*, p. 79.

In granite, quartz has thus a geometric shape, but in sandstones it is in the form of minute particles or grains. The Potsdam Calcareous and Medina sandstones, for example, of this state, generally exhibit no traces in any of their parts

of a crystalline structure, but are formed by a mere aggregation of minute particles, and, on being broken, are easily reduced to the most attenuated granules or dust. They are nevertheless usually represented by geologists as drawn wholly from granite, and as owing their new shape to the fracture, rolling, or abrasure of the crystals, of which they originally formed a part.

"Take for example the very common rock sandstone; its component *grains* of quartz, felspar, and mica, are more or less *rolled or fragmented* crystals of these substances, derived from rocks like gneiss, mica schist, &c., which are also composed of grains of the same kinds, less affected by mechanical processes; or from granite, porphyry, &c., which are purely crystalline rocks. Such derivative sandstones are formed at this day from such crystallized granite and other rocks."—*Phillips's Geology*, vol. i. 31.

"In a general sense, the red sandstone must be considered as formed of *fragments*, more or less minute, of preceding rocks or minerals. When these are of the usual size of sand, the finer sandstones are produced; when larger, the results are coarser gritstones and conglomerates, or breccias. The term sandstone is, however, equally applied to the whole, although rather in a geological than in a mineralogical sense."—*Macculloch's G. C. of Rocks*, p. 402.

In the first place, however, this transformation from crystals to grains is not demonstrated. The mere fact that the particles of sandstone consist of the same elements as the quartz crystals of granite, is no proof that they were derived from that rock, any more than the fact that the elements of granite are essentially the same as gneiss and the primary shales and sandstones is proof that that rock was—according to the hypothesis proposed by Sir C. Lyell—formed from them. Yet the theory has no other ground for its support than the mere similarity of their elements.

In the next place, it is inexplicable, on the supposition that they had their origin in granite, that no traces remain in them of the crystals from which they were drawn. Crystallized quartz, even in the state in which it usually exists in granite, is an extremely hard, and under the action of the chemical and mechanical agents to which it is ordinarily exposed, almost indestructible mineral. That vast moun-

tains, that whole continents towering several miles into the atmosphere, and consisting largely of that element, should have been dissolved and reduced in a great measure to the most comminuted particles by the mere chemical and mechanical forces that are now acting on the surface of the globe, may justly be pronounced a physical impossibility. No effect can be conceived more obviously and absolutely beyond the powers of those agents.

No mode of the production of such a change can be suggested that does not leave the theory embarrassed with this insuperable objection. To suppose the quartz and other crystals in granite to have been subjected to a chemical solution, were first to assume that there were chemical forces then in activity of immeasurably greater energy, and operating on a far wider area, than there now are on the globe. But that is prohibited by the maxims of geology, which require that if the solution of granite mountains and continents is to be accounted for, it should be by forces the same in kind and intensity as those that are now exerting their powers on the earth. Next, if they are supposed to have undergone a solution, then their assumption of their present granular form must have been the effect of a different and peculiar chemical agency. But that is again forbidden by the principles of geology. As no chemical agents are now in activity that generate such siliceous grains and aggregations of grains as those that constitute the Potsdam, Calciferous, Medina, and other sandstones, it cannot, according to the maxims of the science, be assumed that they existed and acted at a former period.

The supposition that they were reduced from crystals to their present granular forms—spherical, irregularly rounded, and angular—by mechanical forces, abrading or fracturing them, is embarrassed by equally formidable difficulties. It is altogether incredible that any mechanical force—as of the waves of the ocean, or the current of rivers—should have acted on every point of vast mountains and continents so as to have broken, worn, and disintegrated their whole mass. It is equally incredible that such agents, acting wherever they might, should have reduced the siliceous elements universally of the masses with which they came in contact, to grains of such a minute and uniform size. No result can be

conceived more wholly without the limits of possibility than that such causes acting with indefinitely varying forces on rocks differing widely in their solidity, should give birth to such extraordinary effects, and in such unvarying uniformity. No such results spring from their present action. The supposition is, therefore, as absolutely prohibited as the others, by the principles of geology.

We might extend this argument to arenaceous shales, granular quartz, the conglomerates of which siliceous pebbles are a principal element, and ordinary sand and gravel. Instead of crystals, they are aggregates of grains, or concretions of minute particles by a law wholly unlike that of geometric crystallization. The theory thus fails as entirely to account for these vast formations as for those that consist of ingredients wholly unlike those of granite.

These considerations thus furnish the most resistless demonstration of its error. Whatever else may be thought to have been susceptible of derivation from such continents of granite,—the vast beds of gravel, sand, salt, chalk, limestone, and sandstone, cannot have been drawn from that source. Their nature, or the forms in which they exist, make the supposition a paradox. The most indisputable proofs are graven on their fronts that that was not their origin. But withdrawing these, there is nothing left through the whole mass of the fossiliferous rocks—even granting that all the other insuperable obstacles to the theory could be overcome—which its advocates can refer to those fabulous continents, except certain conglomerates and those shales and clays of which alumine is a chief ingredient,—a slender basis truly, could they verify their hypothesis in respect to them, on which to erect a demonstration of the immeasurable age of the world! Can a more unfortunate predicament be imagined of writers who have indulged so confident a persuasion that they had established their system by evidence scarcely inferior in certainty to that of mathematics?

8. Passing over, however, all these insurmountable objections to their theory, let us suppose their imagined continents reduced in any requisite measure to disintegration, transformed into sand, gravel, and pebbles, and traversed by streams and rivers of sufficient size and force to bear such materials to the sea; and there still would be no agent by

which they could be spread out on the bottom of the deep over the vast spaces that are occupied by many of the strata. The larger streams, like the Ganges, Indus, Nile, Niger, Amazon, Mississippi, and St. Lawrence, would carry no gravel or sand whatever to the ocean. These great rivers deposit all the heavier particles with which they are charged, in their first stages, hundreds of miles before they reach their mouths, and bear nothing to the ocean but comminuted mud and vegetable matter that is held in solution; and that they throw down almost immediately on reaching the sea. No portion of it, probably, is carried beyond the lines at which their currents are arrested by the resistance of the waters of the ocean: and that is within a very narrow circle, compared to the vast spaces that lie beyond. The result accordingly of their transporting agency is, simply, at first slowly to diminish the depth of the ocean at their mouths, and finally, gradually to extend the dry land at those points into the sea. Their influence is exhausted in the formation of their deltas. The main bed of the ocean is as completely unaffected by them as though they were not in existence. Their limited power, and the narrow sphere within which their agency is circumscribed, forbids the supposition that such rivers can have been the instruments of conveying to the ocean the materials of which the strata are constituted. The area over which many of the strata extend is immense. Gneiss is generally considered as one of the most universal of the rocks, and lies very generally, it is held, between the granite which is the fundamental rock, and the fossiliferous strata. The fossiliferous strata in some of their divisions exist everywhere, except in the narrow spaces in which either granite, or some of the lowest orders of the stratified rocks, rise to the surface. In this country the New York or Silurian system, extending from the lowest of the fossiliferous rocks up to the old red sandstone, and comprising a vast series of sandstones, limestones, and shales, spreads in some of its divisions from the eastern range of the Appalachians to Lake Superior, and from Lake Champlain to the Rocky Mountains, and forming a bed on an average many thousand feet, and in places probably several miles in thickness. The fancy that that vast mass of matter can have been borne there, and distributed in so

equable a manner by rivers, is an extravagance at which common sense revolts. It is only matched in its disregard of probability, by the hypothesis that the limestone and chalk formations are the product of testaceous animals elaborated by them from other matter, of which lime is not in any appreciable measure a constituent. The effect, in the conditions that are supposed, lies wholly out of the sphere of possibility. It might as well be imagined that the granite mountains themselves that rise from beneath these strata and rear their naked summits into the sky, were floated in solid masses by streams or tides from those fabled continents, and planted in their present positions. The cause is infinitely disproportioned to the task that is assigned it. It has none of the qualities that are requisite to the production of such an effect.

Sir C. Lyell, however, notwithstanding he admits that all the heavy matter borne down by a river must fall to the bottom almost immediately on its entering the sea, still maintains that the stream naturally advances the line of its deposits further into the deep, and that the change of the area, by that cause, on which its sediment is thrown down, and a transference of the river itself to a new line and point of debouchure by the elevation or inclination of the continent from which it descends, will sufficiently account for the distribution of the detritus out of which he holds the strata were formed, over the area which they occupy.

"It is only by carefully considering the combined action of all the causes of change now in operation, whether in the animate or inanimate world, that we can hope to explain such complicated appearances as are exhibited in the general arrangement of mineral masses.

"The surface of the terraqueous globe may be divided into two parts, one of which is undergoing repair, while the other, constituting, at any one period, by far the larger portion of the whole, is either suffering degradation, or remaining stationary without loss or increment. The dry land is for the most part wasting by the action of rain, rivers, and torrents; and part of the bed of the sea is exposed to the excavating action of currents, while *the greater part, remote from continents and islands, receives no new deposits. For as a turbid river throws down all its sediment into the first lake which it traverses, so currents flowing from land or from shoals purge them-*

selves from foreign ingredients in the first deep basin which they enter, and beyond this the blue waters of the ocean may for ages remain clear to the greatest depths.

"The other part of the terraqueous surface is the receptacle of new deposits, and in this portion alone the remains of plants and animals become fossilized. Now the position of this area, where new formations are in progress, and where alone any memorials of the state of organic life are preserved, is always varying, and must for ever continue to vary; and for the same reason that portion of the terraqueous globe, which is undergoing waste, also shifts its position; and these fluctuations depend partly on the action of aqueous and partly on igneous causes.

"In illustration of these positions I now observe that the sediment of the Rhone, which is thrown into the Lake of Geneva, is now conveyed to a spot a mile and a half distant from that where it accumulated in the tenth century, and six miles from the point where the Delta began originally to form. We may look forward to the period when the lake will be filled up, and then a sudden change will take place in the distribution of the transported matter; for the mud and sand brought down from the Alps will thenceforth be carried nearly two hundred miles southwards, where the Rhone enters the Mediterranean."—*Principles of Geology*, vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.

No river, however, nor rivers could ever, by that process, spread a layer of pebbles, sand, or the most comminuted mud over the whole bed of a spacious sea; nor bear any appreciable quantity of matter more than a very short distance within the deep. The current of a river on entering the sea, whether the waters of the deep are stationary, or in motion on a line that is transverse to that current, must meet a resistance that instantly checks its rapidity, and soon puts an end to its progress. All the matter accordingly borne forward by its impulse, or held in solution, must necessarily be deposited in the area within which it is circumscribed. Not a particle can ever be carried out of that limit, except by a movement of the waters of the sea that is independent of the river. It is demonstrable, therefore, that the detritus carried down by a river cannot be spread over the whole of the bed of an ocean, or spacious sea; inasmuch as it would require that the current of the river should extend over the whole of the area, and displace the whole

mass of the waters of the ocean, or sea, which is as much out of the circle of possibility as it is that it should transport the solid strata themselves by its current. This part of Sir C. Lyell's theory, therefore, furnishes no solution of the diffusion over the bed of the ocean of the materials of which the strata are formed.

His supposition that it could be produced by a change of the position of the continents from which it is supposed to be drawn, causing a transference of the rivers to new lines and points of debouchure, is equally untenable.

"On the other hand, if a current charged with sediment vary its course—a circumstance which must happen to all of them in the lapse of ages—the accumulation of transported matter will at once cease in one region, and commence in another.

"Although the causes which occasion the transference of the places of sedimentary depositions are continually in action in every region, yet they are particularly influential where subterranean movements alter from time to time the levels of land; and their effect must be very great during the successive elevations and depressions which must be supposed to accompany the rise of a great continent from the deep. A trifling change of level may sometimes throw a current into a new direction, or alter the course of a considerable river. Some tracts will be submerged and laid dry by subterranean movements; in one place a shoal will be formed, whereby the waters will drift matter over spaces where they once threw down their burden, and new cavities will elsewhere be produced both marine and lacustrine which will intercept the waters bearing sediment, and thereby stop the supply once carried to some distant basin.

"Without entering into more detailed explanations, the reader will perceive that according to the laws *now governing* the aqueous and igneous causes, distinct deposits must at different periods be thrown down on various parts of the earth's surface, and that in the course of ages the same area may be again and again the receptacle of such dissimilar sets of strata."—*Principles of Geology*, vol. ii. p. 212.

But this does not account any more than the other for the diffusion of the materials of any one of the strata over the whole bed of the ocean; it only indicates a mode in which the points where rivers enter the sea may be changed from time to time so as to produce a change of the areas at the mar-

gin of the ocean, where the sediment borne down by them shall be deposited. It leaves all the other parts of the bottom of the sea as unprovided as they were before, with materials for the formation of new strata. In order to explain their deposition over the whole bed of the ocean by such a cause, it would be necessary to suppose, not only that the continents from which the matter of the strata were derived, but that small divisions of the bottom of the sea itself, also, were successively elevated, so that the river should in succession enter it at as many points as would be requisite, in order to the deposition of a stratum over its whole area. That, however, cannot have happened; inasmuch as the elevation and depression of the surface in detached parts that must then have taken place at the formation of each layer of the system, would have broken their whole mass into fragments, and reduced them to a promiscuous heap of ruins. But they have suffered no such violence. The New York or Silurian groups which underlie the whole country from the Alleghanies far into the Canadas, and from Vermont beyond the Mississippi, are but slightly dislocated. Throughout a large part of their immense area they lie at a dead level, or moderate inclination, and have never been seriously disturbed in any of their members since their deposition. It is clear then beyond debate, that their materials were never transported to their several places by the action of rivers. The supposition is indeed so palpably at war with the laws that govern their agency, and so absurd and enormous an extravagance, as to render it surprising that considerate persons should have ever entertained it, and made it the basis of an argument for the immeasurable age of the world.

9. And finally, in addition to all these evidences of the error of their theory, the distribution of the elements, siliceous, aluminous, and lime, of which the formations chiefly consist, into separate strata, is an equally decisive proof that they cannot have been drawn from such preexisting continents, nor been borne to their several places and arranged in their positions by the agency of streams, rivers, and currents. The detritus that is wafted down by rivers to the sea, is not separated, on its deposition, according to the species of which it consists, and its different ingredients thrown down on different areas. Instead, they fall together and form a promis-

cuous mass. The only separation that takes place, is of the heavier from the lighter grains and particles,—gravel falling first, sand next, then comminuted mud, and last, light vegetable particles; and as their fall takes place by the force of gravity, the points at which they severally descend are determined by their weight, not by the material of which they consist.

The strata, however, were not formed in that manner, but their great elements were distributed into separate layers; sandstone, sand, and gravel, of which siliceous is the chief ingredient, being arranged by themselves; slate, marl, and clay, which owe their principal character to alumine, forming a different set of layers; and limestone and chalk, of which lime is the great ingredient, constituting beds and masses by themselves. The sand, gravel, and pebbles, moreover, that enter into the composition of many of their layers, instead of being sorted according to size and weight so that they regularly decrease in dimensions in one direction, and increase in the other, as in the deltas of rivers, are distributed indiscriminately throughout the spaces,—sometimes of vast extent—which they occupy. Thus the sandstones of the New York system stretching, there is reason to believe, from Vermont to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Appalachians far into the Canadas, do not vary in the coarseness of their grains and pebbles in any ratio to their distance from their eastern, western, southern, or northern edges, or from any interior points in the area over which they are spread. Nor do those of the carboniferous system, which extend from the Alleghanies through the western part of Pennsylvania and Virginia, the southern part of Ohio, and a large share of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. Their variations, if they vary, are obviously from chemical, not from mechanical or geographical reasons.

These facts form, therefore, the most unanswerable demonstration, in the first place, that the materials of the strata were not derived, as the theory represents, from disintegrated continents of granite,—as they could not then have been assorted as they are, and their several elements arranged in layers by themselves; and in the next place, that the distribution throughout their whole extent, of the sand and gravel that enter into the composition of sandstones and other strata,

were not transported in their present form from a distance to their places, by the action of streams and currents.

Such are the proofs of the error of this extraordinary theory, which refers the materials of the stratified soils to anterior continents and islands of granite. There is not a solitary step in the process which it contemplates at which it is not confuted by a palpable contradiction to the laws of the physical world, and the principles of geology. The supposition with which it commences of the creation of the earth in a state of gaseous fusion, is a paradox. There are no indications where the continents and mountains were stationed, from the ruins of which it is held the strata were formed. Had there been such continents and mountains as the hypothesis implies, they must have been of such an elevation as to have been protected by congelation from being disintegrated and transported to the sea by the action of water. Had they been depressed into a temperate region, still no springs could have emerged from their surface, nor permanent streams and rivers descended from them to the sea. Had they been disintegrated and traversed by streams and rivers, they could never have borne more than an inconsiderable portion of their detritus to the ocean. Had their detritus been transported to the sea, it could not have been transformed into sand, gravel, and pebbles: it could not have been spread over the bed of the ocean: it could not have been assorted according to the materials of which it consists, and formed into separate layers of sandstone, limestone, and shale. There is not one of these processes through which the theory represents the materials of the strata as having passed, that is not in contradiction to the laws of the physical world, and an infinite impossibility. The demonstration is absolute, therefore, that the strata cannot have been formed by these processes, and that the whole theory is groundless and mistaken. The inference accordingly that is founded on it of the vast age of the world, is equally unphilosophical and false.

That branch of their theory which relates to the sources whence the materials of the strata were derived, and the agents by which they were conveyed to their place of deposition being thus confuted, the next inquiry respects their other great postulate, that the original formation of the strata

and the modifications to which they have been subjected, were the work of the chemical and mechanical forces that are now producing changes in the earth's surface, and were the result of agencies, in the main, of only their present measure of intensity. If this postulate, on which they found the most of their reasonings, is shown to be gratuitously assumed also, inconsistent with the most important characteristics of the strata, and in contravention of the principles of the science, then the second main ground of their inference of the great age of the world will also be overthrown: and such is undoubtedly its character.

As it is apparent from the preceding discussion that streams and rivers have had no important agency in the conveyance of the materials of the strata to the points of their deposition, they are in the main excluded from the question. There are no traces of their influence until a large part of the depositions were formed, and whatever effects they may have produced towards the close of the secondary and during the tertiary periods, they must, from the resistance currents from the land meet on entering the ocean, have been confined to the vicinity of the points of their debouchure. The question, therefore, as far as all the most extensive and important effects are concerned, relates only to the chemical and volcanic forces, and the mechanical agencies of the ocean under which the strata were formed, and subsequently thrown into their present conditions.

1. And in the first place, the assumption that all these great effects are the result of the causes that are now in activity, and arose gradually from agencies of essentially the intensity they are now exerting, is based on altogether inadequate and mistaken ground. It certainly is not a self-evident proposition. There is nothing in the nature of the strata themselves that shows directly that they must have been formed exclusively by causes like these, acting with only their present energy. If that is made a principle or postulate of the science, it must first, like other facts, be established by appropriate evidence. But no such demonstration of it is furnished by geologists. It is either assumed without any attempt at its verification, or founded on vague and imaginary analogies. Thus Sir Charles Lyell, for example, who in the construction and support of his theory rea-

sons altogether from the present to the past, takes for granted at every step of his argument, the point on which its validity depends;* namely, not only that the causes now producing geological effects on the globe are the same in kind as those to which the stratified rocks owe their existence and modifications, but that the scale on which they are now acting, and the rate at which they are giving birth to their several effects, are the measure of the energy with which they acted, and the rapidity with which they wrought their results, in the formation of the strata. For he offers nothing but the effects themselves that are now in the process of production, the strength of the agents that are bringing them into existence, and the rapidity with which they are wrought, as proofs that all the geological effects of ancient times which it is his aim to explain, were wrought by the same agents at the same rate; and thence makes the ground of his inference that the periods occupied in their production must have been of the immeasurable length which he ascribes to them. But the effects that are now taking place plainly yield no verification of his inferences, unless it is either self-evident, or is shown by extraneous proof, that all the geological effects in question must necessarily have been produced by the same cause, acting uniformly with the same energy. But that,

* "Now the principal source from whence we are enabled to draw such conclusions respecting the nature of the solid materials of the earth, and the changes which they have undergone, is a comparison of geological phenomena with the effects previously known to have been produced in modern times by running water and subterranean heat. Hence the utility of one of the preceding treatises on aqueous and igneous causes, in which it was shown that strata are at present in the course of formation by rivers and marine currents; both in sea and lakes; and that in several parts of the world rocks have been rent, tilted, and broken, by sudden earthquakes; or have been heaved up above, or let down below their former level; also that volcanic eruptions have given rise to mountain masses made up of scorix, and of stone both porous and solid. . . .

"From these remarks it will be seen that a study of systematic treatises on the recent changes of the organic and inorganic world, affords a good preliminary exercise for those who desire to interpret geological movements. They are thus enabled to proceed from the known to the unknown, or from the observed effects of causes now in action, to the analogous effects of the same or similar causes which have acted at remote periods."—*Lyell's Principles, Preface*, pp. xiii, xiv.

instead of proving, he takes for granted. His argument, accordingly, expressed syllogistically, is nothing more than the following:

All the geological changes that have been produced on the globe have been the work of causes identically the same in kind, energy, and the rapidity with which they produced their effects.

But the causes that are now giving birth to geological changes are feeble, and advance at a very slow rate in the production of their effects.

Therefore, the causes under which the formation of the stratified rocks took place, must have been similarly feeble, and advanced at a similarly slow rate in the production of their effects.

And again :

The energy with which geological causes act, and the rate at which they give birth to their effects, are uniformly the same at all periods.

But the energy of the causes that are now working changes on the earth is slight, and long periods are occupied in the completion of their effects.

Therefore, the causes by which the strata of the earth were produced were equally slight in their energy, and periods equally long in proportion to the magnitude of the effects they produced, were occupied in their completion.

The whole point to be established, is thus assumed in the premise from which it is deduced. He proceeds throughout his discussion on a mistaken view of the real question in debate—which is, what the causes were by which the stratified rocks were formed, and what the mode was of their agency and the rapidity with which they wrought their effects—which is to be determined by the nature of the effects; not—which is the position he employs himself in endeavoring to evince—whether, on the supposition that the causes that are now giving birth to geological effects, are in nature, strength, and rate of production, identically like those by which all former effects were produced, immeasurably long periods must not have been occupied in their completion. In the one case, those ancient effects are made the measure of their causes; in the other, modern effects, which are wholly inferior in magnitude, and in a large

degree of a different nature, are made their measure. His whole system is thus built on the assumption of the premise from which it is deduced. He accordingly does not generally attempt directly and absolutely to demonstrate the solutions he suggests of the phenomena, real or presumed, which he endeavors to explain; but presents them simply as suppositions which—admitting the postulate on which he proceeds—furnish possible or probable explanations of them. Thus it is by such a mere hypothesis that he endeavors to account for the great variations in the temperature of the globe, which he assumes have taken place.

“I shall now proceed to speculate on the vicissitudes of climate which must attend those endless variations in the geographical features of our planet, which are contemplated in geology. That our speculations may be confined within the strict limits of analogy, I shall assume, 1st, That the proportion of dry land to sea continues always the same; 2dly, That the volume of the land rising above the level of the sea is a constant quantity; and not only that its mean, but that its extreme height, are liable only to trifling variations; 3dly, That both the mean and extreme depth of the sea are invariable; and 4thly, It may be consistent with due caution to assume that the grouping together of the land in great continents is a necessary part of the economy of nature; for it is possible that the laws which govern the subterranean forces, and which act simultaneously along certain lines, cannot but produce at every epoch continuous mountain chains, so that the subdivision of the whole land into innumerable islands may be precluded.

“If it be objected that the maximum of elevation of land and depth of sea are *probably* not constant, nor the gathering together of all the land in certain parts, nor even *perhaps* the relative extent of land and water: I reply, that the arguments about to be adduced will be strengthened, if in these peculiarities of the surface there be considerable deviations from the present type. If, for example, all other circumstances being the same, the land is at one time more divided into islands than another, a greater uniformity of climate might be produced, the mean temperature remaining unaltered; or if at another era there were mountains higher than the Himalaya, these, when placed in high latitudes, would cause a greater excess of cold. Or if we suppose that at certain periods no chain of hills in the world rose beyond a height of 10,000 feet, a greater heat might then have prevailed than is compatible with the existence of mountains thrice that elevation.

"However constant may be the relative proportion of sea and land, we know that there is annually some small variation in their respective geographical positions, and that in every century the land is in some parts raised, and in others depressed by earthquakes, and so likewise is the bed of the sea. By these and other ceaseless changes, the configuration of the earth's surface has been remodelled again and again since it was the habitation of organic beings, and the bed of the ocean has been lifted up to the height of some of the loftiest mountains.

"If we now proceed to consider the circumstances required for a *general* change of temperature, it will appear from the facts and principles already laid down, that whenever a greater extent of high land is collected in the polar regions, the cold will augment; and the same result will be produced when there is more sea between or near the tropics; while, on the contrary, so often as the above conditions are reversed, the heat will be greater. *If this be admitted*, it will follow, that unless the superficial inequalities of the earth be fixed and permanent, there must be never-ending fluctuations in the mean temperature of every zone; and that *the climate of our era can no more be a type of every other*, than one of our four seasons of all the rest.

"To simplify our view of the various changes in climate which different combinations of geographical circumstances may produce, we shall first consider the conditions necessary for bringing about the extreme of cold, or what may be termed the winter of the 'great year,' or geological cycle, and afterwards the conditions requisite to produce the maximum of heat, or the summer of the same year.

"To begin with the northern hemisphere, let us suppose those hills of the Italian peninsula and of Sicily, which are of comparatively modern origin, and contain fossil shells identical with living species, to subside again into the sea from which they have been raised, and that an extent of land of equal area and height, varying from one to three thousand feet, should rise up in the Arctic ocean, between Siberia and the north pole. In speaking of such changes I shall not allude to the manner in which I conceive it possible that they might be brought about, nor to the time required for their accomplishment—reserving for a future occasion not only the proofs that revolutions of equal magnitude have taken place, but that analogous operations are still in gradual progress. The alteration now supposed in the physical geography of the northern regions would cause additional snow and ice to accumulate where now there is usually an open sea; and the temperature of the greater part of

Europe would be somewhat lowered, so as to resemble more nearly that of corresponding latitudes of North America; or, in other words, it might be necessary to travel about 10° farther south to meet with the same climate which we now enjoy. No compensation would be derived from the disappearance of land in the Mediterranean countries; but the contrary, since the mean heat of the soil in those latitudes is probably far above that which would belong to the sea, by which we imagine it to be replaced.

"But let the configuration of the surface be still further varied, and let some large district within or near the tropics, such as Mexico, with its mountains rising to the height of twelve thousand feet and upwards, be converted into sea, while lands of equal elevation and extent rise up in the arctic circle. From this change there would, in the first place, result a sensible diminution of temperature near the tropic, for the soil of Mexico would no longer be heated by the sun, so that the atmosphere would be less warm, as also the neighboring Atlantic. On the other hand, the whole of Europe, Northern Asia, and North America would be chilled by the enormous quantity of ice and snow, thus generated at vast heights on the new arctic continent. If, as we have already seen, there are now some points in the Southern hemisphere where snow is perpetual down to the level of the sea, in latitudes as low as central England, such might assuredly be the case throughout a great part of Europe, under the change of circumstances above supposed; and if at present the extreme range of drifted icebergs is the Azores, they might easily reach the equator after the assumed alteration. But to pursue the subject still farther,—let the Himalaya mountains, with the whole of Hindostan, sink down, and their place be occupied by the Indian Ocean, while an equal extent of territory and mountains of the same vast height rise up between North Greenland and the Orkney Islands. It seems difficult to exaggerate the amount to which the climate of the Northern hemisphere would then be cooled. . . .

"Let us now turn from the contemplation of the winter of the 'great year,' and consider the opposite train of circumstances which would bring on the spring and summer. To imagine all the lands to be collected together in equatorial latitudes, and a few promontories only to project beyond the thirtieth parallel, would be undoubtedly to suppose an extreme result of geological change. But if we consider a mere approximation to such a state of things, it would be sufficient to cause a general elevation of temperature. Nor can it be regarded as a visionary idea that amidst the revolutions of the earth's surface, *the quantity of land* should, at certain periods, have been *simultaneously lessened* in the vicinity of both the poles, and

increased within the tropics. We must recollect that even now it is necessary to ascend to the height of fifteen thousand feet in the Andes under the line, and in the Himalaya mountains which are without the tropic, to seventeen thousand feet, before we reach the limit of perpetual snow. On the northern slope, indeed, of the Himalaya range, where the heat radiated from a great continent moderates the cold, there are meadows and cultivated land at an elevation equal to the height of Mont Blanc. If, then, there were no arctic lands to chill the atmosphere and freeze the sea, and if the loftiest chains were near the line, it seems reasonable to imagine that the highest mountains might be clothed with a rich vegetation to their summits, and that nearly all signs of frost would disappear from the earth.

"When the absorption of the solar rays was in no region impeded, even in winter, by a coat of snow, the mean heat of the earth's crust would augment to a considerable depth; and springs, which we know to be in general an index of the mean temperature of the climate, would be warmer in all latitudes. The waters of lakes, therefore, and rivers, would be much hotter in winter, and would never be chilled in summer by melted snow and ice. A remarkable uniformity of climate would prevail amid the archipelagoes of the temperate and polar oceans, where the tepid waters of equatorial currents would freely circulate. . . .

"We might expect, therefore, in the summer of the 'great year,' which we are now considering, that there would be a predominance of tree-ferns and plants allied to palms and arborescent grasses in the islands of the wide ocean, while the dicotyledonous plants and other forms now most common in temperate regions would almost disappear from the earth. Then might those genera of animals return, of which the memorials are preserved in the ancient rocks of our continents. The huge iguanodon might reappear in the woods, and the ichthyosaur in the sea, while the pterodactyle might flit again through umbrageous groves of tree-ferns. Coral reefs might be prolonged once more beyond the arctic circle, where the whale and the narwal now abound; and droves of turtles might wander again through regions now tenanted by the walrus and the seal.

"But not to indulge too far in these speculations, I may observe, in conclusion, that however great during the lapse of ages may be the vicissitudes of temperature in every zone, it accords with this theory that the general climate should not experience any sensible change in the course of a few thousand years, because that period is insufficient to affect the leading features of the physical geography of the globe."—*Principles*, Book i., chap. vii., pp. 121–131.

This is perhaps the most ingenious and elaborate theory presented by Sir Charles Lyell in the whole course of his speculations to account for the geological conditions which he supposes to have once existed; and were the reality of those conditions admitted, it would in some respects form a plausible solution of the effects he refers to them. Instead, however, of being established by a scientific induction, it is a mere *supposition*. Not a pretence is made of demonstrating it by direct and indubitable evidence. Every one of its propositions that is made the basis of the inference he aims to sustain by it, is preceded by an IF, tall,

“As the mast
Of some great admiral.”

The only consideration he offers to support it is, that if the conditions and processes he supposes *are admitted*, they seemingly furnish a natural and adequate explanation of the variations of temperature and peculiar forms of vegetable and animal life, which he holds characterized the earth at certain stages of its ancient history. It contributes nothing, therefore, towards the verification of his general theory respecting the force by which the strata were formed, and the vast series of ages their deposition occupied. To treat it as a fact; to exalt it to the rank of a positive proof of that great hypothesis; to make it the basis of a rejection and confutation of the testimony of the Scriptures respecting the date of the creation of the earth, is truly an extraordinary misjudgment. The fact that it apparently presents an explanation of the conditions and events it is invented to explain is no evidence of its truth. To admit the validity of such a method of establishing a system would be at a blow to annihilate every fact of experience, and overthrow every truth of science. The theory of Buffon, of Burnet, of Whiston, of La Place, respecting the origin and laws of the world, might, by such a process, be as effectually established as that of Newton.

Its want of pertinence to the immediate purpose for which he employs it is not, however, its only disqualification for the support of his system; as he deserts in it the great postulate on which he professedly proceeds, that the forces

that are producing changes in the earth's surface act without intermission and with a uniform energy ; and tacitly assumes that those forces at certain crises operate with thousands of times their ordinary intensity, and give birth to changes immeasurably above the usual range of their effects ; as it is inconsistent with the conditions he prescribes to himself, to suppose that under such a process, "the general climate should not experience any sensible change in the course of a few thousand years ; because that period is insufficient to affect the leading features of the physical geography of the globe," which he supposes to be so wholly revolutionized. It would be impossible that such an elevation of a continent with lofty mountains in one part of the ocean, should take place simultaneously with a depression of an equal area of land with mountains of the same height in another ; and yet at the same time, "the proportion of dry land to sea continue the same ; the volume of the land rising above the sea be a constant quantity ; and not only its mean but its extreme height be liable only to trifling variations ; and both the mean and extreme depths of the sea be invariable," unless the change took place instantaneously, or at least was completed in so brief a space that the period occupied in it would not be of any geological consideration. For on no other condition could the proportion of dry land to sea, the volume of land above the level of the sea, and both the mean and extreme height of the mountains, continue the same. If the elevation, for example, of the supposed continent in the sea between Greenland and the Orkneys, took place at the same rate as the depression of the Himalaya mountains and Hindostan, and advanced so gradually as to be prolonged through a vast round of ages, it is manifest that Hindostan would descend beneath it thousands of years before the corresponding part of the arctic continent could emerge from its bosom. The submersion of Hindostan would take place in the early stages of the revolution ; the ascent of the other at its close. During the vast period therefore that intervened, the proportion of dry land to sea, and of the volume of land rising above the level of the sea, instead of remaining constant, would, to that extent, be altered ; and consequently an equal change would be produced in the mean and extreme depth of the ocean. More-

over, as there are great inequalities in the surface of Hindostan, a large part consisting of low plains, part of high table lands and elevated valleys, and part rising into lofty mountain ranges—other subordinate variations in the proportion of land to sea would take place while the submersion was in progress. A depression of two to three hundred feet would carry beneath the waters all the lower plain of the Ganges and a wide tract along the eastern coast of the peninsula, probably together equal to one third of the whole. A further descent of five hundred feet would leave nothing above the waves except the mountains, the table lands, and the high valleys that lie between the ranges or heights of the Himalaya. The table lands that slope from the Ghauts on the western side of the peninsula to the opposite coast on the bay of Bengal, rise from 1700 to 2800 or 3000 feet above the level of the ocean; and the lower of the high valleys of the Himalaya, 2000 feet. They would be submerged therefore by an additional descent of 1200 to 2200 feet. A further depression of 1200 to 1500 feet would carry beneath the waters other valleys of the Himalaya, that are at an elevation of 4000 to 4500 feet. There would then remain south of the Himalaya only the Vindhyan range of mountains, running across the peninsula, north of the Nerbudda to the western coast, and the western and eastern Ghauts, the former of which rise from 6000 to near 9000 feet.* There would thus be five or six stages in the submersion, at which great changes would take place in the proportion of the land to the sea, and of the volume of land rising above the water. Equal variations also in the opposite direction would result from the emergence from the ocean of those parts of the supposed arctic continent, that would correspond to these divisions of Hindostan.

It is physically impossible, therefore, that the changes he contemplates should take place without producing repeated and great variations in the average of the extent and the volume of dry land, and of the depth of the sea, unless they were wrought with such rapidity that the time which they

* McCulloch's Geographical Dictionary; Articles Himalaya and Hindostan. Guyot's *Earth and Man*, p. 66.

occupied should be of no consideration. But to be accomplished with such rapidity would require an intensity of volcanic forces immeasurably transcending those that are ordinarily exerted in the modification of the earth's surface. The effects also would boundlessly surpass in magnitude any that are now in progress, or that have happened for many ages. Such a depression of one continent and elevation of another would produce movements of the ocean also, on a scale and of a violence immensely beyond those of ordinary disturbances of its bed by earthquakes. Wide-spreading deluges, and the wreck of islands and continents generally, would inevitably result from them.

He thus in this hypothesis completely deserts the theory of the uniform force and activity of geological agents, on which he founds his system; and tacitly raises those of fire and water to so vast an energy, and exhibits them as acting on so stupendous a scale, and despatching their effects with such celerity as to discountenance and set aside the grounds on which he builds his inference, that long periods have been employed in the deposition and modification of the strata. Of this purely supposititious character are many of the other solutions which he presents of the phenomena he attempts to explain; and such are the speculations also generally of those who maintain that the stratified rocks were formed by the geological agents that are now in activity, and at a rate essentially the same as that at which they produce their present effects.* They are mere conjectures or suppositions, not demonstrated facts, and present, therefore, no basis for a scientific induction of the inference they found on them of the great age of the world.

In the next place: But this great postulate of their system is not only merely hypothetical and unsupported by evidence; it is confuted, and shown to be wholly groundless, by the fact that many of the most extensive and important of the geological effects which it professes to explain, are not

* We may indicate as examples, their theories respecting the production of gneiss, the origin of lime and chalk, the formation of salt and coal, the causes of denudation, the sources of drift, the deposition of alluvia, the periods at which different classes of animals began to exist, and a crowd of others.

now in the process of production, nor the causes to which they owed their existence any longer in activity. If the assumption were correct that the forces by which geological effects are produced are in the main at all periods identically the same, act uniformly with the same energy, and generate the changes to which they give birth at the same rate, then every class of effects that has ever resulted from their agency would continue to be wrought by them at the present time, and on a scale as vast as at any former period. Nothing, however, is more certain than that many of the most important species of those effects are no longer taking place, and thence that the causes in which they originated are no longer in activity, at least in the conditions and forms in which they give rise to such products.

1. Such is the formation of granite. That rock is more extensive, exists in greater volume, and fills and has filled a more important office in respect to the sedimentary strata, than any other in the series. It is far the greatest and the most significant of the effects that are the subject of geological inquiry. It wraps, it is generally believed, the whole circle of the globe, and is the basis on which all the other formations rest; and it has come into existence, or received its present form, at least to a vast extent, since the formation of large portions of the rocks which now repose on it. Those masses of it indisputably which rise above the original level of the sedimentary rocks, and form the centres of the great mountain ranges, were formed and elevated into their present positions after the deposition of the strata that lie on their summits, or rest on their sides, and they are now accordingly referred by geologists generally to the close of the secondary, or to the tertiary period.

But no granite, so far as is known, is produced at the present time, nor has been since the formation of the masses that constitute the main element of the great mountain ranges, and were the instrument by which the sedimentary strata that clothe their sides, and rest on many of their heights, were thrown up. There is not the slightest proof, or probability even, that a particle of it has been crystallized for ages. What the conditions are, indeed, that are essential to its formation, are not fully known. It is generally held to be the result of fusion; but what the precise combination

of causes is, or what the circumstances are in which they must act in order to unite the ingredients of which it consists in the proportions and forms that constitute its peculiarities, there are no means in the present state of the science of determining.

The greatest and most important geological process that has ever taken place on the earth's surface, and that was wrought on its greatest scale, at a late period in the formation of the sedimentary strata, is thus wholly unlike any that is now in progress, or has been for ages, and confutes therefore the theory that the forces by which the crust of the earth was formed and modified, exist and operate with the same energy, and give birth to the same species of effects, and on the same scale, at all periods.

2. Gneiss, also micaceous, chlorite, and argillaceous schist, quartz rock, and other species that belong to the first series of the stratified formations, are not now in the process of deposition, and have not been for ages, nor are there any indications that the causes from which they sprang are any longer in activity. These also, though not universal, like granite, are very extensive. They underlie very generally, as far as is known, the secondary formation, and are, in many localities, of immense depth. They constitute proofs, therefore, as vast as they themselves are, that the geological forces by which the strata have been formed, do not act without intermission, and with an unvarying energy, and give birth to their effects at the same rate at all periods. If that were their law, these rocks, instead of being confined to the primary formation, would have been intermixed with the whole secondary and tertiary series, and would now be generating on as great a scale as they were in their own proper age. Can a more emphatic confutation be asked of the doctrine, that geological causes act at all periods with an unvarying energy?

3. Serpentine, greenstone, basalt, and nearly the whole series of trap rocks, also came into existence exclusively, so far as is known, at a period long past. They were first thrown up, it is generally held, after the completion of the primary series, and their epoch appears to have closed near the commencement of the tertiary. They were as manifestly the product of a limited period, and owed their existence to

a condition of the globe that no longer exists, as the formation of granite, gneiss, quartz rock, old red sandstone, or any other rock, the production of which has ceased. To assume, as a self-evident proposition, that the causes by which these immense masses were thrown up from the unfathomable depths of the earth, through the vast series of crystalline, primary, and secondary rocks, are still in uninterrupted activity, and giving birth on an unvarying scale to the same effects, and make that postulate the basis of a theory of the whole series of formations, is to offer a contradiction to fact that is not often exceeded in boldness and extravagance.

4. Sand, gravel, and pebbles, are still more important elements of the earth's crust, that owe their existence to causes that are no longer in activity. They not only form, in a great measure, the loose unstratified mass that lies on the surface of the globe, but enter very largely into the composition of the principal layers in every group of strata throughout the secondary and tertiary formations,—sandstones of every class, many conglomerates, and the arenaceous forms of shale and limestone—and constitute not improbably one third of the whole mass from the lowest to the last of the fossiliferous beds. And they were all formed undoubtedly by chemical forces at the points and at the time of their deposition from the ocean; as there are no known agents by which, had they originated elsewhere, they could have been distributed over such vast spaces, and immixed so equably in the strata in which they are imbedded. Had the materials of which they consist been originally derived, as geologists maintain, from granite continents, and borne down to the sea by rivers, they still must have received their present form after their diffusion through the waters from which they were precipitated; as their structure is not now crystalline like that of the quartz, felspar, mica, and hornblende of granite, but granular and concretionary, and the product therefore of a wholly different chemical agency. Their formation is, accordingly, one of the greatest and most peculiar of which the surface of the earth has been the theatre. The number of particles, grains, pebbles, and stones of larger size, that belong to this class in single layers of moderate extent, transcends immeasurably our powers of enumeration,

and can be grasped only by Omniscience. How infinite then is the multitude that constitute their whole mass! Many of the strata of which they are the principal ingredient, are spread over vast areas, and of great depth. Groups of the old red sandstone are in some localities three or four thousand feet in thickness. Yet every one of those grains and pebbles, small or large, is of itself a proof of the error of the doctrine that the causes by which they were produced are still in activity, and perpetually giving birth to similar formations. Not a particle of sand or gravel, not a solitary pebble or mass of larger size, like those which are imbedded in conglomerates, has been brought into existence for ages. The supposition is, as we have already shown, inconsistent with the conditions that are requisite to such concretions. The silex that is now deposited on the earth's surface, is deposited from waters that are raised to an intense heat, and instead of uniting to form sand or gravel, takes the shape of incrustations on stems, leaves, and other objects on which it happens to be thrown down. As absolute proof as the lapse of many ages, without a solitary addition to their countless throng, can form, exists therefore, that neither the chemical agents are now in activity, nor the waters of the ocean in the conditions that are requisite to their production. The fancy that they are, is as palpably against the fact, and as irreconcilable with the laws that now govern the modifications of matter, as it were to imagine that new suns are forming in our firmament, or new moons generating to revolve with ours around our earth.

5. Such is the fact, also, with lime. No deposits of that mineral now take place on the surface, except such as is thrown up by springs, and is derived therefore from the strata over which those waters run: and that, on its deposition, forms a loose porous mass, essentially unlike the limestones from which it is drawn. Not a grain is added by the process to the general mass of the mineral. There is only a transference of particles from earlier formations that lie at a considerable depth, and union of them again at the surface in a new form. But if the causes that originally gave birth to the vast beds of limestone that occur throughout the whole series, from the earliest to the latest of the stratified rocks, are still in uninterrupted activity, and generating new

deposits on as great a scale as at former periods, why is it that none of these new formations are noticed or discoverable? Why is it that not a particle can be shown to be added to the aggregate? What can be more unscientific than thus to maintain the continued activity and undiminished energy of causes that once operated on so immense a scale and generated such massive products, though no fruits whatever are seen of their present agency; though the most indisputable proofs of their discontinuance for ages are presented in the fact, that through that long period they have not given birth to any of their proper effects?

6. Chalk was in like manner, the product of peculiar causes acting in peculiar circumstances for a limited period. It is not, like limestones, sandstones, and shales, distributed in frequent beds throughout the whole series of the strata, but occurs only in a single group near the close of the secondary formation. Nor is it generally diffused like many of the earlier and later deposits, or found in all the localities where the other members of the group to which it belongs occur. Instead, it is confined to comparatively narrow limits.

"Respecting the geographical distribution of the cretaceous group . . . throughout the British Islands, a large part of France, many parts of Germany, in Poland, Sweden, and in various parts of Russia, there would appear to have been certain causes in operation, at a given period, which produced nearly, or very nearly, the same effects. The variation in the lower portion of the deposit seems merely to consist in the absence or presence of a greater or less abundance of clays or sands, substances which we may consider as produced by the destruction of previously existing land, and as deposited from waters which held such detritus in mechanical solution. The unequal deposit of the two kinds of matter in different situations would be in accordance with such a supposition. But when we turn to the higher part of the group, into which the lower portion graduates, the theory of mere transport appears opposed to the phenomena observed, which seem rather to have been produced by deposit from chemical solution of carbonate of lime and siliceous matter."—*Sir H. T. De la Beche's Manual*, p. 259.

The limitation of this formation to a single period and to a narrow area, is thus wholly irreconcilable with the theory

that geological causes act at all periods and with a uniform energy. If that postulate were true, chalk should exist, and on as great a scale in the different groups of the primary and earlier classes of the secondary formations, as it does in the series to which it gives its chief characteristic. It should occupy a proportional place also among the tertiary strata, and be in the process of formation at the present time. No indications appear, however, of such formations since the commencement of the tertiary period. Can a more decisive proof be demanded of the error of that postulate? Can a proposition be advanced in more direct and palpable repugnance to facts?

7. Rock salt, in like manner, instead of being interspersed like sandstone, limestone, and shale through the whole succession of the strata, as the theory of the uniform activity and energy of geological causes requires, is confined to a single era. There are examples, indeed, of the rise of salt springs, as in this state, from the New York or Silurian system. Even they, however, are generally associated with the new red sandstone, or the groups with which that is immediately connected; and rock salt itself occurs only in that formation. Though found in every quarter of the globe, it is not, like sandstone and shale, a universal deposit, but exists only in patches, or districts widely separated from each other. It is in some localities several hundred feet in thickness. Geologists, however, instead of being able to point out any exemplification in the processes that are now going forward of the mode in which it was formed, have not hitherto succeeded in presenting any probable theory of its origin.

"It is not surprising that the origin of rock-salt has been a subject of much inquiry among geologists; yet nothing like a rational theory has yet been offered. It is far easier to show that the most simple and obvious hypothesis is wrong or imperfect than to propose a probable one. The origin of gypsum is not less mysterious, even with every conjecture we can make respecting the presence and acidification of sulphur; yet this inquiry has never excited the same anxiety. No rational explanation has yet been suggested; and I have none to offer. But we must seek for the greater ambition of geologists on the subject of salt, in their wish to derive these deposits from the

waters of the ocean in a simple and direct manner; seizing on one obvious analogy only, to the neglect of other possible modes of explanation. That it has been the produce of the ocean is possible, since the rocks among which it is found are indebted for their existence to the same source. Yet no obvious method of accounting for its peculiar appearances or limitation can be engrafted on that general admission; while it were as well for geology, and in other matters than this, if they who deposit pure rock salt in the Mediterranean at this day, would learn at least as much of chemistry as the 'Chemist' of three blue bottles. The desiccation of saline lakes will not account for it, because subterranean salt is far more pure than that which must be the produce of the evaporation of the sea. The mode in which it is disposed will not admit of this explanation; and still less can any system of evaporation account for the concretionary structure of the salt of Cheshire.

"To these difficulties it must be added that the depth of sea-water required to produce in this manner some of the larger masses known in Europe, is incomprehensible. It might also be asked why marine organic bodies have never been found in or near it, and wherefore it is accompanied by gypsum. As it is lastly true that the strata which lie above it have been deposited from the ocean, it is impossible to comprehend how, under these circumstances, evaporation could have taken place. The subject is beset with difficulties—fortunately for cultivators of a science which would lose the greater part of its attractions were there nothing left for them to explain. As to the theory which derives it from volcanic actions, it seems useless to discuss such a question, when no volcanic rocks accompany these deposits in the sandstone, and when, with some very slender exceptions, deposits of salt are not found attending on this class of rocks. Were this the cause, it would remain also to be explained why it is limited to the red marl."—*Macculloch's Geology*, vol. ii. pp. 293, 294.

"We shall not call in question that gem-salt, either pure or mixed with muriatiferous clay, may have been deposited by an ancient sea; but everything evinces that it was formed during an order of things bearing no resemblance to that in which the sea at present, by a slower operation, deposits a few particles of muriate of soda on the sands of our shores."—*Humboldt's Narrative*, vol. ii. p. 262.

It is thus the product almost exclusively of a single period, and of causes or circumstances so obscure and peculiar that no satisfactory theory can be formed of their nature. It presents a resistless confutation, therefore, of the

postulate, that the causes of geological effects are always in activity, and giving birth to their several results on the same scale. Why, if that be true, are not masses of rock salt found at every stage in the series, from the primary formations to the close of the tertiary? Why are they not now in the process of deposition in the bays and gulfs of the sea?

8. Coal is likewise the product of peculiar causes and a limited period; and of causes or conditions, that, so far from being understood, are as much in debate among geologists, as the origin of rock salt. That it was formed beneath the ocean and mainly of vegetables that had their growth on the land, are the only points in respect to which they are in any considerable measure agreed. It is held by one class that those vegetables grew where the coal lies, and by another that they were transported from a distance by rivers and currents. Some maintain that it had its origin in peat; and others in arborescent ferns and forest trees. That the principal beds are of a single period, proves that the causes by which they were generated acted only at that epoch; and that they are confined to a few limited areas, shows that they acted only in those scenes, and confutes the doctrine accordingly that the geological agents by which the strata were formed, have acted at all periods, and given birth to their effects at a uniform rate.

Coal ought, on that theory, to be found in as great abundance in the primary and tertiary series as in the secondary, and to be forming as visibly and rapidly at the present period as any other geological effect that is now taking place.

But besides these and other classes of effects that were peculiar to the eras when they were brought into existence, and sprung from causes that are no longer in activity, it is equally apparent that some of the geological agents that are still producing changes on the earth's surface, instead of operating at all times with the same energy, must have acted during the formation of the strata with far greater intensity and on a much wider area than at present. This is admitted by many geologists.

“ Although it is maintained in one of the most popular geological systems that the powers of nature are as active and energetic at the

present as in ancient periods, still, after a survey of the whole subject, and of the evidence on which those views rest, doubts of their correctness remain in the minds of most geologists. That a more quiescent state should now prevail, and that the former violence of the elements should be restrained, or rather become more feeble by a more equable balance of the forces which act and react on each other, is agreeable to reason and the benevolence of the Great Architect of the universe."—*Emmons's Geology of the Second District of New York*, p. 17.

Thus the ocean, either from chemical elements immixed in it, the motion of its waters in tides and currents, or other causes, must have had a power of diffusing the materials of the strata that were introduced into it, over wide areas, that is altogether unknown at the present period. There are many strata of sandstone, limestone, and shale, that originally extended, there is reason to believe, without interruption, many hundreds, and perhaps even thousands of miles, the elements of which, therefore, as they were deposited at the same epoch over their whole area, must have been inter-fused through the whole body of the waters. And where the beds, after solidification, are fifty, one hundred, or perhaps several hundred feet in thickness, as the materials cannot all have been supported by the waters at the same time, the agents by which they were transported to the place of deposition must have continued in activity for a considerable period. But no such power of holding matter in solution or suspension, and distributing it over vast areas, is now displayed by the ocean. The clay, sand, gravel, and ashes that are now introduced into it by streams or volcanic eruptions, are thrown down near the points where they enter its waters, and produce no change whatever on its bottom generally. The slight force with which it now acts, and the narrow spaces to which its effects are confined, scarcely present an analogy to the vast scale on which it operated at earlier periods and the massy results to which it gave birth. To take the power with which it now acts as the gauge of its energy at former epochs, is as unauthorized and unphilosophical, as it were to make the slight effects which it now produces the measure of those of all other ages.

Next: The action of the ocean on the continents and islands in the erosion of mountain ranges, denudation of hills, or level tracts of strata, and scooping of valleys, which took place on a stupendous scale at former epochs, has no parallel in its present agency. Instead of sweeping over the land in resistless deluges, cutting passages for itself through rocky barriers, and ploughing channels betwixt the hills and across plains, it is now confined to its decreed place, and its proud waves are stayed by the limits God has assigned it. No greater contrast can be conceived than that which the limited energy with which it now acts in its narrow sphere, presents to the resistless power with which in former ages it swept the continents and islands, tore asunder their rocky ranges, cut deep gorges through the strata, and transported to new positions vast masses of the loose earths that form the present surface.

The fires, in like manner, that burn in the depths of the earth, and have acted a more important part than any other agent in producing the changes that have taken place on the surface, exerted their power on an immeasurably greater scale in former ages than at present.

This is seen from the immense formations at early epochs of granite, of which none, so far as is known, is now in the process of production.

It is seen from the vast masses of porphyry, greenstone, basalt, and other rocks of that class that are of volcanic origin, which are wholly the product, it is generally held, of the secondary, or the first stages of the tertiary period.

It is seen also from the great number of volcanoes in every part of the globe, once active and disgorging immense masses of lava, that have now for many ages been wholly extinct. The number that now burn without intermission is very small. They once amounted, there is reason to believe, to many thousands.

It is demonstrated in a still more striking manner, in the universal changes they produced in the surface, in the upheaval and dislocation of the strata, and the elevation of the hills and mountains. These great effects are now referred by geologists universally to subterranean fires, or the evolution of heat by processes causing an intense fusion and expansion of the materials on which it acted;

and the energies by which they were wrought must have immeasurably surpassed the most powerful that are now exerted in earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. All the expansive forces that have shaken the earth for ages united, would have been wholly inadequate, there is reason to believe, to throw up the Andes, the Himalaya, or the Alps. This is admitted by many geologists, who nevertheless maintain that vast periods have been occupied in the formation of the strata.

"If now we withdraw ourselves from the turmoil of volcanoes and earthquakes, and cease to measure them by the effects which they have produced upon our imaginations, we shall find that the real changes they cause on the earth's surface are but small, and quite irreconcilable with those theories which propose to account for the elevation of vast mountain ranges, and for enormous and sudden dislocations of strata, by repeated earthquakes acting invariably in the same line, thus raising the mountains by successive starts of five or ten feet at a time, or by catastrophes of no greater importance than a modern earthquake. It is useless to appeal to *time*; time can effect no more than its powers are capable of performing; if a mouse be harnessed to a large piece of ordnance, it will never move it, even if centuries on centuries could be allowed; but attach the necessary force, and the resistance is overcome in a minute."—*H. T. De la Beche's Manual*, p. 131.

The vast changes indeed that have been produced on the earth's surface, so far transcend the forces that are now in activity, as to render the supposition that they have resulted from their operation, an extravagance unworthy of the support of men of judgment and science.

This great postulate of their theory is thus, like the other, wholly irreconcilable with the facts of geology, and the laws of chemical and mechanical forces. So far from having resulted from the agents that are now producing changes on the crust of the globe, and acting with their present energy, all the great processes by which the principal rocks, from the earliest to the latest, have been formed, have sprung from causes and conditions that were peculiar to the epochs when they were produced, and are no longer in existence; while the energy exerted at former periods by some of the agents that are now in activity, and the spaces on which they acted,

were immeasurably greater than at present. The overthrow of that postulate involves the confutation accordingly of the inference founded on it of the vast age of the world. As the strata cannot have been formed by the feeble agents and slow processes which that postulate represents, the inadequacy of those agents to a rapid production of such stupendous effects, is no proof that immeasurable periods,—which would add nothing to the strength or efficiency of such causes—must have been occupied in their production. That an insect would be unable to drag a heavy mass of matter from its place, though the effort were prolonged for countless ages, presents no ground for the conclusion that a similar period would be required for its removal by an elephant or a steam locomotive. Yet it is on such a transparent fallacy that the whole deduction proceeds of the vast age of the world, from the tardy rate at which geological causes are now giving birth to their several effects.

These main foundations of their theory being thus overthrown, the only ground that remains for its support, is that which is supposed to be furnished by the vegetable and animal relics that are imbedded in the strata. But their inference from them of the great age of the world, is equally unauthorized and unphilosophical.

In the first place, it is, like their other arguments, founded, in a great measure, on their theory of the agents and processes by which the strata were formed; not on the nature, condition, or mass of those relics themselves; and is built, therefore, on an assumption of the point which it professes to demonstrate.

In the next place: Neither the masses of those fossilized relics, nor the conditions in which they are preserved, present any decisive or probable evidence that the immense periods which geologists assume were occupied in their growth and deposition. In respect to the coal formations, for example, lignites, and other vegetable fossils, the supposition of vast periods is not requisite at all to account for the growth of sufficient masses of vegetables to constitute such deposits. The vegetables existing on the globe at a single epoch, were they gathered into spaces commensurate with those that are occupied by the mineralized vegetables, are enough, not improbably, to constitute deposits of equal bulk.

The difficulty, accordingly, of accounting for their vast dimensions, does not lie at all in their quantity, but in their transportation to the places of their deposition. But that is not obviated, in any degree, by the supposition that great periods were occupied in its accomplishment. That supposition, indeed, is forbidden by the condition of the coal strata. That the leaves, stems, and trunks, of which they are formed, neither grew in the places of their deposition, nor were transported there gradually through a series of ages, is clear from the fact that they had undergone no decay, but retained their structure and forms uninjured when the process of their fossilization commenced. Had a long period passed during the accumulation of a stratum, those that were first deposited would have been decomposed, and changed into vegetable mould. The lowest layers, however, of beds that are ten, twelve, or fourteen feet in thickness, exhibit no traces of such a decomposition. The forms of the stems and leaves are there as distinct and perfect as in the layers at the upper surface. Had they been transported, and slowly accumulated there by streams and currents charged by detritus from continents or islands, there would have been a large mixture in them of earthy particles, such as now takes place in the deposition of trees, plants, and leaves at the mouths of rivers. But no such foreign ingredients are intermingled with them. The main beds consist, throughout their whole mass, of pure vegetable matter. These facts demonstrate, therefore, both that they were transported from other sites, and that their accumulation, deposition, and the first steps of their fossilization, were accomplished with great rapidity.

Nor are vast periods any more necessary to account for the animal relics that are buried in the strata. So far from it, the slightness of these remains presents a resistless demonstration that no such incalculable series of ages, as geologists assume, can have elapsed during their deposition. It is infinitely incredible, had the ocean and extensive continents and islands, been peopled through such immeasurable periods as thickly as they now are, that their relics would not have been imbedded in vastly greater numbers and masses in the strata. This is too apparent to admit of dispute in respect to all vertebrate animals, both of the land and the sea. If all the relics of those classes that have hitherto been

found in different localities, are taken as a measure of the quantity that lies buried throughout the globe in the strata to which they belong, the whole mass can scarcely exceed the number that subsists at the present epoch,—certainly not the crowds that people the land and sea in the lapse of one or two centuries. Of this any one may convince himself, who considers how countless the multitudes were of the wild animals that lived on this continent three centuries ago, or how innumerable they and the droves and herds of tame animals are at the present period: what infinite hosts of fish people the waters of the torrid zone, and what armies of cod, mackerel, herring, and other tribes swarm at certain seasons on the coasts of New England, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. Multitudes equivalent to these, a few times repeated, would equal, there is reason to believe, the whole of like classes that are entombed in the strata. The difficulty in accounting for their deposition, accordingly arises, not from the greatness, but rather from the slightness of their numbers, compared to the period during which they may have been accumulating. Two or three centuries seem as adequate to their production as fifteen or twenty.

Such is the fact also with the relics of testaceous and infusorial animals, which exist on a scale, and are multiplied with a rapidity as much greater proportionally, than the vertebrate classes, as their dimensions are less than theirs. The seas along the shores in every part of the globe, but especially in the equatorial and temperate climes, swarm with infinite hosts of testaceous animals. Thus Mr. Darwin relates:

“The kelp” of the seas in high southern latitudes, sometimes—
“grows to the length of sixty fathoms and upwards. . . Captain Fitz Roy found it growing up from the depth of forty-five fathoms.

“The number of living creatures of all orders whose existence intimately depends on the kelp, is wonderful. A great volume might be written describing the inhabitants of one of these beds of sea weed. Almost all the leaves, except those that float on the surface, are so thickly incrustated with corallines as to be of a white color. We find exquisitely delicate structures, some inhabited by simple hydra-like polypi, others by more organized kinds, and beautiful compound Ascidiz. On the leaves also, various patelliform shells, trochi, uncovered molluscs, and some bivalves, are attached. Innumerable crus-

tacea frequent every part of this plant. On shaking the great entangled roots, a pile of small fish, shells, cuttlefish, crabs of all orders, sea eggs, star fish, beautiful holothurians, planariæ, and crawling nereidous animals of a multitude of forms, all fall out together. Often as I recurred to a branch of the kelp, I never failed to discover animals of new and curious structures."—*Darwin's Voyage of the Beagle*, p. 240.

But the infusorial tribes pervade the waters at every point, and in some localities on a scale in numbers as far transcending that of the larger animals as their bulk is less. They swarm in such incalculable multitudes in some localities, as to give their color to the whole mass of the water over large areas.

"During a run of fifty leagues, the sea was constantly of an olive green color, remarkably turbid, but it then changed to a transparent blue. The green appearance of the sea in these latitudes I formerly ascertained to be occasioned by an innumerable quantity of small molluscous animals of a yellowish color contained in it. A calculation of the number of these animals in a space of two miles square and 220 fathoms deep, gave an amount of 23,888,000,000,000."—*Scoresey's Journal of a Voyage to the Northern Whale Fishery*, 1822, p. 18. See also pp. 351, 353.

"We entered on a zone where the whole sea was covered with prodigious quantities of medusas. The vessel was almost becalmed, but the molluscs were borne towards the southeast with a rapidity four times that of the current. Their passage lasted near three quarters of an hour. We then perceived but a few scattered individuals following the crowd at a distance, as if tired with the journey."—*Humboldt's Narrative*, vol. i. p. 72.

These and other forms of infusorial animals existed not improbably in far greater multitudes at those epochs in the formation of the strata, when the waters of the seas were charged alternately with much greater quantities than at present of silex and lime. The vast scale on which they exist, and the rapidity with which they succeed each other, is such, therefore, that instead of a long series of ages being requisite to account for the masses in which they are accumulated in certain localities, it would be inexplicable had

such incalculable periods passed, that their relics had not risen to an immeasurably greater bulk. The cause, if supposed to act through an innumerable series of ages, would as far transcend the magnitude of the effect, as the vertebrate and testaceous animals of such incalculable periods would exceed in number the relics of their classes that are imbedded in the strata.

The whole ground on which they have founded their induction of the great age of the globe, is thus swept from beneath them. They not only have not established their theory by legitimate and adequate proofs; they have not advanced a solitary consideration that yields it support. Their whole argument proceeds on postulates that are gratuitously assumed, and that are in blank contradiction both to all the great facts of the science and the laws themselves of matter. That so mistaken a system should have gained the assent and advocacy of so large a body of studious and talented men, is truly a matter of astonishment. The fact, indeed, that they universally and unhesitatingly concur in assigning a vast period to the formation of the strata, is sometimes alleged as a proof of the validity and amplitude of the evidence on which their judgment is founded. The unanimity and ardor with which they maintain it, and the disquietude and not infrequently discourtesy with which they receive a doubt of its truth, are certainly remarkable. Their concurrence, however, is seen to be entitled to but little weight, when it is considered that it is almost absolutely confined to this branch of their speculations—that there is not another question in the whole range of their system, in regard to which they do not entertain a wide diversity of opinion. They are not agreed, for example, whether the world, at its creation, was in a gaseous or in a solid form. They are not agreed in respect to the processes by which granite, gneiss, schist, and the other primary rocks were produced. They are not agreed in respect to the point at which the secondary series commences, the order of the strata, the sources from which some of their elements were drawn, nor the agencies to which they owe their peculiar structure. They differ in respect to the point at which vegetable and animal life commenced, and the forms which it first assumed. They

entertain the most diverse and absurd opinions respecting the origin of limestone, coal, gypsum, chalk, magnesia, iron, and salt. They hold conflicting views in regard to the state of the globe at the epoch of the different formations, the forces by which the strata were dislocated, the causes by which the mountains were upthrown, the period at which land animals were first called into existence, and the origin of the races that now inhabit the globe. They differ likewise, to the extent of countless ages, in regard to the period that has elapsed during the formation of the strata. In short, beyond the simple facts that the strata have been formed since the creation of the earth, that chemical and mechanical forces of some kind were the principal agents in their deposition, and that the fossilized forms that are imbedded in them once belonged to the vegetable and animal worlds,—there is scarce a topic of any moment in the whole circle of the science, in respect to which they do not maintain very diverse opinions; there is scarce a solitary point so fully ascertained as to be placed beyond doubt. Their unanimity in assigning a vast round of ages to the world, while they thus disagree in respect to *the nature of the processes to which they suppose those incalculable ages were requisite*, instead therefore of giving strength to their induction, indicates that the grounds on which it rests are mistaken. What can be more absurd than to suppose that an inference erected on such a mere mass of gratuitous assumptions and disputable theories, can be entitled to the rank of a philosophic induction? What can be more preposterous than to dignify a branch of knowledge in which there is so little that is settled, and so much that is in debate, with the lofty title of an accurate science? It cannot, as a whole, rise any higher, in a demonstrative relation, than the parts of which it consists; the conclusion cannot acquire any greater validity than the postulates possess from which it is drawn.

They have not then, as their theory represents, unfolded and established a series of facts that are at variance with the scriptural history of the creation, and that render it certain that the earth had, at the epoch at which that dates its existence, already subsisted through innumerable ages; nor is there anything in their discoveries that detracts in the least from that inspired narrative. So far from it,

as their speculations are built throughout on hypotheses, not upon facts;—as their inference is drawn from supposititious conditions and imagined processes, not from causes and conditions that are real and capable of being verified; the fancy that they have convicted the sacred record of error, and demonstrated the vast age which they assign to the world by unanswerable evidence, is as groundless and mistaken as it were to imagine that the scriptural account of the creation is confuted by Buffon's hypothesis, or that Newton's theory of the motions of the planets is overthrown by Descartes' fancied vortices. The history of the creation in Genesis remains untouched. If it is to be controverted it must be by proofs, not by assumptions: by arguments founded on a real, not on a supposititious world. When, however, the question of its truth is tried by its proper criteria, it will be found—as we shall show, on resuming the discussion in our next number—that instead of being confuted, it is corroborated by all the facts of the strata, and all the laws that govern the action of geological forces.

ART. II.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE
FIGURES OF ISAIAH, CHAPTER XXI.

THIS chapter contains three visions, the first relating to Babylon, the second to Dumah, the third to Arabia.

"The sentence of the desert of the sea"—that is, waste or expanse of water which gave to the region half immersed, the aspect of a vast uncultivated and uninhabitable morass. That Babylonia is the subject of the vision, is shown by the annunciation with which it closes of the fall of its capital. The description is appropriate to the great plain of the Euphrates extending from above Babylon to the Persian gulf, which, ancient historians relate, was, until dykes were erected, overflowed by the river at the annual flood, and made to assume the appearance of a sea.

1. Comparison. "As whirlwinds in the south rush, from the wilderness it comes, from a terrible land," v. 1. This announcement is peculiarly striking from its abruptness.

The nature of the evil about to be foreshown had not yet been indicated; but no simile could have been employed bespeaking in a more startling manner its suddenness and resistlessness. The rushing whirlwinds in the south are the simooms or hot blasts of the desert that overwhelm and suffocate those whom they overtake, and sometimes bury them beneath the drifting sands. To the inhabitants of that clime no more awful image of unavoidable and sudden destruction could be presented.

2. Apostrophe. "A dire vision is revealed to me: the deceiver deceived, and the spoiler spoiled. Go up, O Elam; Besiege, O Media; all its sighing"—the sighing which it causes—"I have made to cease," v. 2. The prophet beheld the scene in vision; the stratagem by which the Babylonians—who had been accustomed to take the cities they assailed by artifice—were now themselves to be captured; the spoliation to which they—who had plundered so many others—were in their turn to be subjected, and the termination of the cruel sway by which they had caused the conquered nations to groan. With this awful spectacle before him, he summons the Persians and Medes to advance to the siege, and announces their success by the discontinuance of the sighs the Babylonian tyranny had occasioned.

3, 4. Metonymies of Elam and Media for the inhabitants or troops of those countries.

The prophet next describes the effect of the vision on himself.

5, 6. Metaphors in the use of filled and seized. "Therefore are my loins filled with pain: pangs have seized me like the pangs of a travailing woman; I am perturbed—made restless—by the hearing; I am agitated at the seeing," v. 3.

7. Comparison of the pangs with which he was seized to those of a woman in travail. It is apparent from the last of these expressions that the prophet beheld the conflict of the contending hosts, and heard the clang of their arms, the shouts of the victors, the cries of the terrified population, and the shrieks and groans of the wounded and dying. The effects the spectacle produced were such as are usually caused by scenes or events that overwhelm with terror and dismay;—a derangement of the body giving birth to pain,

lassitude, and a tremulous or convulsed movement of the whole frame.

8. Metaphor in the use of turned: "My heart is bewildered; horror has appalled me; the night of my pleasure he has turned into" a night "of fear for me," v. 4. The meaning of this last expression seems to be, that the night of the overthrow of Babylon which the prophet had looked forward to with desire and pleasure as the period when the Israelites that were then to be held captive were to be released from their oppressors, and their sighing made to cease, was depicted to him in the vision in such awful colors, that, instead of exhilarating, it overwhelmed him with agitation and dismay. This mode of exhibiting the awful features of God's judgments, by the effects the sight of them produced, sometimes on those who were exposed to them, and sometimes on the seer to whom they were revealed, is often employed in the prophets. Chap. xiii. 6, 8; xvi. 11; Jerem. xlviii. 36-41.

9. Apostrophe to the princes of Persia and Media. "The table is spread, the watch is set, they eat, they drink; arise, ye chiefs, anoint the shield," v. 5. That the Babylonians had spread the table for the feast, that they had set the watch on the walls for the night, and that they had begun to eat and drink, are mentioned to indicate that the moment had arrived when the Medes and Persians should prepare for the onset by anointing their shields, that they might ward off the darts that might be hurled against them. It is related in Daniel that the monarch of Babylon gave a feast in the palace to a thousand of his nobles on the night in which the city was taken; and Herodotus and Xenophon state that Cyrus was induced to make the attack on that night by information that a festival was then to be celebrated, in which the inhabitants generally were accustomed to indulge in revel and intoxication.

The spectacle the prophet had hitherto beheld, was that of the city, besieged and taken while the monarch and people were feasting. The scene is now changed. He is directed to set a watchman at a distance—whether near Jerusalem or in the other direction towards the Persian capital does not appear—to look out for the messengers who were to be dispatched to announce the news of the capture of the city.

"For thus saith the Lord to me, Go set the watchman; that which he sees let him tell. And he saw a rider; a pair; a rider of an ass, a rider of a camel; and hearkening, he hearkened with great diligence," v. 7. This indicates that he first saw a person borne on a beast, without being able to determine the nature of the animal; then a pair; and at length, as they advanced toward him, discerned that one rode an ass, and the other a camel. They might have been at the distance perhaps of several miles, or at least too remote to allow the voice of the forward rider to be heard by the watchman. In the interval, while the messengers were approaching, the watchman announces that he was on the look out.

10. Comparison. "And he cried like a lion; on the watchtower, Lord, I stand during the day, and on my ward I am stationed all the night," v. 8. This mere assurance of his attention, without alluding to the riders he had seen, was not unnatural, as from their distance he was not able to discern that they were messengers or heralds. On their advancing so near that he could distinguish them, he announces first their near approach, and then the news which the most forward of them proclaimed.

"And behold there comes a man-rider; a pair of riders: And he speaks and says: Fallen, fallen is Babylon; and all the images of her gods he has broken to the earth," v. 9. This implies that one of the riders kept in advance of the other, and first gave the news, perhaps in answer to a signal or call from the watchman. What an impressive delineation! No mere narrative could have presented such a living picture of the scene.

11. Apostrophe. "O my threshing, and the son of my threshing floor! What I have heard from Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel, I have declared unto you," v. 10.

12, 13. Elliptical metaphors in denominating the people of Judea his threshing and the son of his threshing floor. The sense is the same as though the expression had been, O my people; the contemporaries of the prophet,—who are my threshing, that is the grain I have raised and threshed. They are called his threshed grain, and the son or produce of his threshing floor, to indicate that he was to appoint their chastisements, and purify them by them; and that they were to

continue to be his, and to be precious to him, even in the season of their greatest trials.

"The sentence of Dumah. There is a calling to me from Seir: Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman says: Morning comes, and also the night. If ye will inquire, inquire, return, come," v. 11, 12. Dumah is a part of Arabia Petrea, bordering on Syria, and derives its name from the Ishmaelitish tribe that occupied it. The inquiry from Seir,—the mountain probably,—implies an expectation of intelligence that was to affect their well-being. Whether it related to the consequences that were to result to them from the fall of Babylon, or the conquest of Kedar, that is foreshown in the following verses, there are no means of determining. It is probable it was the latter, as Dumah lay immediately north of Kedar. The announcement of the watchman indicates that no herald had yet come with information,—that he witnessed nothing from his watch-tower but the usual succession of day and night; and that if they would obtain the intelligence which they desired, they must inquire again and again.

14. Elliptical metaphor in the use of burden for the severity of war. "The sentence of Arabia. In the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge, O ye caravans of Dedanim. To meet the thirsty they bring water, the inhabitants of the land of Tema; with his bread they prevent"—i. e., anticipate—"the fugitives; for they fled from the presence of swords, from the presence of a drawn sword, and from the presence of a bended bow, and from the presence of the burden of war," v. 13-15.

15. Comparison. "For thus saith the Lord to me, Within yet a year, as the years of a hireling shall the glory of Kedar cease; and the remnant of the bows of the mighty men of the children of Kedar shall be small. For Jehovah God of Israel hath spoken it," v. 16, 17. The Dedanim were a commercial tribe of Arabs, who resided, it is supposed, on the Persian gulf, near half way from its head to the sea. That their caravans, on their passage through Arabia to Egypt, probably by the head of the Red Sea, were to lodge in the thickets for concealment, implies that the country was to be the scene of war. That the inhabitants of Tema, which lay south of Kedar, were to bring water and bread to

the fugitives, indicates that the invaders of Kedar were to proceed from the north, or from Syria. That they were to fly from a drawn sword and bended bow, shows that they were to fly from enemies who waged a war of extermination; not from mere oppressors. Who the conquerors were, or what the period of the invasion was, there are no means of determining.

ART. III.—THE TRUE GOD KNOWN ONLY BY FAITH.

BY REV. GEORGE DUFFIELD, D.D.

"WHAT is God?" is a question of infinite importance to every rational and accountable creature. Whether he is an intelligent personal agent or a sublimated essence—part and parcel, or the entire of what philosophers call nature—is not a vague topic for useless speculation or theory. It has a direct and powerful bearing on the moral character and conduct, the hope and destiny of man. His religious belief and sense of moral obligation generally quadrate with his idea of the nature of Deity. Error in the latter respect inevitably leads to error in both the former.

And yet, the consciousness of every natural man teaches him, that left to the guidance of his own reason, after his utmost researches, he must confess himself ignorant of the true God. Zophar the Naamathite did but express this consciousness when he asked Job, "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" Who does not feel also, with him, compelled to exclaim: "It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, yea, broader than the sea!"

Philosophic minds among the ancient heathen, wandered in a perfect labyrinth, when attempting to search after God. Fate, destiny, necessity, chance, nature, and the *anima mundi* are familiar expressions indicating how vague were their ideas, and how utterly ignorant were they of the per-

sonality of the divine intelligence. Would that philosophic theorists of the present age had not closed their eyes upon the true light! and that the pantheistic absurdities of ancient Greece and Rome had not found apologists and advocates in our own day! It is a melancholy fact that some who claim to be accounted ministers of Christ, and Christian theologians, by their theories on the subject of divine inspiration, by their speculations as to the divine nature, and by their "oppositions of science falsely so called," seem ambitious to rank themselves among "the wise and prudent," from whom were hidden, as Christ says, the plain truths of the gospel that are obvious to "babes and sucklings." Notwithstanding all their boastful pretensions to superior knowledge and philosophical discernment, while they receive not implicitly by faith the sacred Scriptures as God's testimony, in respect to matters of fact, it may be as pertinently remarked of them, as of proud unbelievers in the days of Jeremiah, "they have rejected the word of the Lord, and what wisdom is there in them?"

We confess ourselves to be greatly alarmed in view of developments going on in our own country as well as in Europe, and especially of the manifest disposition and attempt on the part of many teachers of religion to accommodate the grand essential truths and facts of revelation,—Christianity as taught by the Saviour and his apostles, to the opinions and deductions of mere reason. Most fatal to evangelical religion and the knowledge of the true God must be the effect of reducing the preternatural scheme of "redemption through the blood of Christ, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace," to the level and within the limits of a system of mere natural religion.

By this we mean mere laws of nature suggesting themselves to men's speculative reason and conscience, and discoverable without any special divine revelation. All the radical principles of the moral law are indeed founded and interwoven in the constitution of human nature. The rational mind is competent to discern their propriety, excellence, and obligation. No other instructor or revelator is needed in order to that than the light of nature. The understanding, in its natural reasonings, and the conscience with its natural sense of obligation, take such cognizance

of God's moral government as to make men feel their accountability to him, and indicate sufficiently for their reproof and condemnation, the authority of the call of duty which they neglect and violate. Mere moral government, or the simple government of law, can accomplish among our fallen race nothing more, whatever may be the extent to which natural reason may carry men in civilization, morality, and refinement. However men may "do by nature the things contained in the law," and be "a law unto themselves," they do but "show the work of the law written in their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." The revelations of Christ in the Scriptures are infinitely above such a system of government by mere law.

To make the gospel merely such a system is but refined deism; not, indeed, the deism of a former century, which was open and undisguised in its rejection of divine revelation, but the masked deism of the present growing apostasy from the truth, the covert and traitorous delivery of Christ into the hands of his enemies with a Judas-like salutation, "Hail, master"—and betrayal of him with a kiss! We are not at all surprised that in the progressive spirit of modern improvement certain speculative divines—the rationalists of the day—should even attempt to go beyond the Saviour himself and discourse to us about the nature and essence of Deity, and claim to possess an intuitive knowledge of God; nor that they should undertake in their proud philosophizing to explain the very mysteries of his being, and seek to reason a personal God, if not out of existence, at least out of their own and others' conceptions. "The world by wisdom knew not God," "but professing themselves to be wise they became fools."

The incipient ravings of this folly are not wanting already, in the speculations of these high priests of nature, who, exalting what they call reason and science as the only reliable revelators, and making them the supreme oracle and expositor of the sacred Scriptures, pantheistically pursue their researches and study of God himself, as though he were identical with the human mind, and all the vital, chemical, and geological phenomena of the creation were but the phases of his being and essence. Ask them the ques-

tion, "What is God?" and how quickly are you lost in the mist and maze of their vain reasonings! We much prefer for answering that question, the form of sound words which presents, in fit expressions, the simple scriptural idea; and having stated the fact as the Saviour himself has done, that "God is a Spirit," there leave it, without any attempt to analyse his essence, or to frame from analogy a "vain imagination" for the amusement of our minds.

The sacred Scriptures are the only source whence we can obtain correct reliable information as to who God is, and what he is. There he himself speaks and tells us all we need to know, in reference to the mysteries of his Being, and to the glories of his character. How absurd to seek elsewhere for this knowledge, when we have in them so clear and competent a teacher, such a full and satisfactory revelation! Who would employ the dim lamp, the glow-worm's feeble ray, to illumine his path, when the glorious sun of heaven poured its brilliant light around him? And shall we be referred to the schools, to philosophy, to human reasonings, to natural religion, or to what is called natural theology,—a feeble, flickering light at best,—when "we have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts?" Jesus Christ, the brightness of his Father's glory, like the glorious orb of day, has poured forth his own divine effulgence in the sacred Scriptures. There studying, and thence, by faith, learning, we too, as did those who saw "the Word made flesh," "that dwelt among" them, may "behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

The value of the sacred Scriptures as an instructor in the knowledge of God, it is obvious, depends wholly upon the character of their inspiration. If they claim to be a distinct, clear, infallible, authoritative revelation from God;—if he himself speaks in them, in such a way as to make him, and not fallible man, responsible for the truth of their statements, then have we the most reliable source of information. We can have none better. Who so competent to instruct us on every subject as God, and especially in respect to himself? And how simple and delightful do the means of knowledge

become! To believe God! Faith does indeed humble the philosopher, and bring him down to the level of the child. But it is admirably adapted to the weak and inexperienced who constitute the multitude, and elevates the young and unlettered above the wisdom of the wise, and the prudence of the ancients, who prefer their own reasonings about God to the teachings of his word.

The Scriptures themselves, distinctly and formally, without the least qualification or doubt, announce that God is their author and not man. It is not by any poetic license of speech, but literally and truly, a sober verity, that they claim to be **THE WORD OF GOD**. Everywhere, in the writings of Moses and of the prophets, we are apprised of this fact, by such forms of expression as these continually recurring, "God said," "thus hath Jehovah spoken," "the word of the Lord came to me," "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken," "this is the message," "this is the word the Lord hath sent," &c. If all this be poetry, and needs æsthetical teaching to enable us to detect it, then is the Bible a gross imposition upon the unlettered, and popery has done well to keep it *in retentis*.

What if various parts of the sacred Scriptures bear the names of particular men, and some no name at all? That they are therefore of exclusive human origin, is altogether a *non sequitur*. For the inference proceeds on the manifestly fallacious assumption, that God could not, in any preternatural way, employ the minds and tongues of men, to communicate his will. Will any one attempt to prove this assumption true? It were to deny to God a power conceded to and exercised by men, who often employ others to record what they dictate, without ceasing to be the authors of that which they cause to be written. So Moses, David, Isaiah, and others both known and unknown by name, were employed by God as amanuenses (how, it concerns us not to inquire, the fact is of principal consequence)—to record what he designed should be communicated to and preserved among men, without their becoming thereby the authors and originators of the several books written by them and comprised in the sacred Scriptures.

Our argument here is wholly concerned with those who admit and profess to believe the sacred Scriptures to be a revelation from God. The modes God may have employed in

communicating to those who wrote the information or knowledge they have delivered, do not in the least degree affect the merits of the question; nor is it a matter of importance for us to ascertain their nature. The Scriptures themselves apprise us of different modes, adopted by God, to make known his will to men—all of them extraordinary and miraculous. Dreams, visions, words uttered, thoughts and language preternaturally impressed on the mind, special overruling care and direction in guiding, influencing, restraining, and aiding, so as to make the language appropriate, and the communication authentic and reliable as from himself, have all been adopted. But by whatever variety of method God imparted his inspiration, the fact is affirmed of all that "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." The same account of the matter is given in direct reference to the whole volume of the Old Testament, as it existed in the days of Christ and of his apostles, and was approved and accredited in the synagogues as the word of God. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." The New Testament writings, in like manner, are authenticated and affirmed to be such a relation of truth as makes God the responsible and reliable author, so "that our faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." And Paul explicitly declared of himself, "we speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

The Bible thus becomes the highest possible authority, and the most reliable source of information; so that, to dispute, or refuse to accredit its statements, is to reject, not the word of man, but the word of God—an offence of a capital nature. No right or place is left us here, to interpolate our reasonings, to substitute our sense of propriety, or to sit in judgment upon what part or how much of the sacred Scriptures we may receive or reject. Carefully and accurately to ascertain what is their meaning, by applying the common sense and well established rules of interpretation, is both appropriate and obligatory. But this done,—the meaning of the sacred record being determined, our minds must bow implicitly to the authority of the divine testimony, and receive its statements agreeably to the proper and legitimate

import of the language, as unquestionable verity, or we do not believe.

If the sacred Scriptures, as the word of God, deserve not to be so received, they are the veriest imposture. For, that they affirm and claim for themselves, uniformly, and in the most explicit manner, to be his word, cannot be denied. If they are not,—then, falsifying and grossly deceiving us in this one essential particular,—their statements deserve to be accredited no more. But if, and as they verily are his word,—then who are we that dare to doubt, distrust, and dispute with God? To one or other alternative, in this dilemma, are we reduced. All attempts at compromise, by allowing human reason to sit in judgment, and as umpire to decide how much or how little of the Scriptures we may believe, are but denials of their infallible inspiration and divine authority. Any middle ground here is but disguised infidelity. Every appeal from their testimony to human reasoning, to philosophy, to “science falsely so called,” is but an insult offered to God.

Decrees, confessions, creeds, may be and are useful for various purposes, and, in many cases, become indispensable as a means of discipline. But they are only the judgment of men as to what the Scriptures affirm or teach. As mere human productions, they may not, in all respects, conform exactly to the Bible, and in so far as they deviate from it, they can have no binding authority on the conscience. Every moral agent, having the light of the gospel, is under obligation to go to “that only infallible rule of faith and practice,” there to hear or learn what the Almighty saith. Nowhere else can we truly learn who and what God is; nor by any other means than faith.

It is worthy of remark, that unlike men’s systems and treatises of “natural theology,” the Scriptures never undertake to prove God’s existence. Being a revelation of and from himself, it would have been as much out of place to have done so, as it would be for the writer of this article to prove that he exists. It might well have excited our surprise and distrust. Assuming the divine existence as an admitted and unquestionable fact, they are the only books that give us any rational and reliable information as to his essential nature and glorious perfections. Incidentally, how-

ever, they overpower us with *a posteriori* demonstrations of his existence.

The human mind, unaided by the light of revelation, and from an observation of the works of creation, may, and does often, ascertain that there is a God. "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead, so that they are without excuse." By the very laws of human thought, where we trace design, we conclude there must have been a designer. Thus the rudest savage reasons; and the speculations of a theistic philosophy about fate and nature, and of pantheistic mysticism identifying the universe with God, can never possess and control the popular mind and counteract the practical deductions of sober common sense. Polytheism has commended itself to the masses, incomparably beyond the pantheism and atheism of philosophers. It is much easier, constituted, as the human mind is, to believe in a multitude of gods than that there is none at all. It may deceive itself as to whom he may be, but it instinctively infers from what is made that there must have been a maker.

That devoted missionary, Hans Egede, whose self-sacrificing zeal and labors were so greatly blessed among the Esquimaux upon the coast of Labrador, said that he found the idea of a God current among them, notwithstanding their deep darkness and degradation. When conversing with a young man of their nation, he asked him how he knew there was a God? The youth replied, as he relates: "I made this kajak (a contrivance which served the double purpose of a boat and sled); it did not make itself. I then ask myself, and who made me? I say my father; but I ask again: and who made my father, and his father? and so back till I see there must be some Great One, who made the first man and all things." There is more light and power in this simple argument of the savage to commend it to the common sense of mankind, than in all the *a priori* reasonings and subtle metaphysics of philosophers. The argument may be thrown into endless forms, and expanded with all the ingenuity which Cicero concedes to Chrysippus, in its presentation, but substantially it is still the same. "*Si enim inquit, est aliquid in rerum natura, quod hominis*

mens, quod ratio, quod vis, quod potestas humana, efficere non possit; est certe id, quod illud efficit, homine melius. Atqui res cælestes, omnesque eæ, quarum est ordo sempiternus, ab homine confici non possunt: est igitur id, quo illa conficiuntur, homine melius. Id autem quid potius dixeris, quam deum? Etenim si dii non sunt, quid esse potest in rerum natura homine melius? in eo enim solo ratio est, qua nihil potest esse præstantius. Esse autem hominem, qui nihil in omni mundo melius esse quam se putet, desipientis arrogantia est. Ergo est aliquid melius. Est igitur profecto deus."* The human mind, conscious of its own intelligence and power, is satisfied with its causality in all matters to which it is competent. But when it sees operations and effects beyond its own wisdom and energies, it concedes to such causality the superior excellence which God alone can possess.

Still, all such reasonings, however they may lead the mind to rest in God, as the great first cause of all things, leave us ignorant of his nature and attributes. Assuming that all creation is the work of his hand, we naturally expect to meet some traces of his character. As wisdom evidently planned, and power executed, we conclude that these, in their loftiest degrees, must be his perfections. The traces of goodness, too, discernible in the various adaptations and arrangements of nature—so beautiful, so wonderful, and so admirably calculated to secure enjoyment and happiness among the creatures—indicate to us that benevolence or love must form one of his attributes. But here natural, unaided reason begins to fail, encountered by a host of embarrassing difficulties and enigmas. Objections arise, tending to excite distrust and leading to doubt, whether there may not be as much of malevolence, if not actually more, than of benevolence in God? Endless forms of suffering, teeming wretchedness, terrible agencies in nature, famines, earthquakes, floods, horrible pestilences, and ferocious warlike passions, arraying nation against nation, and man against his fellow, swell the constant tide of death sweeping over earth, and making it but the vast cemetery of

* De Natura Deorum.

the race. With no other than nature's light, the mind may sometimes question whether the God of creation is not rather cruel and malignant than kind and benevolent; or at least whether there may not be some other mighty being opposed to him, and nearly, if not fully, as capable of deranging his constitution of things, and making, what seems to be designed by him for good, as efficient for evil?

Thus many philosophic minds among the heathen have reasoned. Innumerable traces of such a conviction are found among the superstitions of the world. Multitudes have believed in the existence of two great antagonistic beings, to either or both of which they have rendered equal homage and honor. Others, while neglecting the good through fear, have paid especial regard to the evil. Had we not a clearer revelation than the light of nature, we should have been left for ever to flounder here in the dark.

That revelation, it has been sometimes said, we have in ourselves. Man having been created in the image of God, and after his likeness, being but the mirror to reflect his glory, the best source of knowledge as to the divine character, it is thought, is to be found in our own minds and hearts! If mankind, however, as they live in their natural state, unrenewed and unenlightened by the grace of Jesus Christ, are to be regarded and studied as the likeness or image of God, we shall be as quickly and as fully involved in inextricable darkness and ignorance of the divine character as we should have been had we been left merely to the study of nature around us. For, reasoning from the specimens of human nature current and most abundant in the world, the conclusion would become inevitable that there is vastly more of the selfish, the vindictive, the passionate, and the malevolent in God than of the opposite. While malignant selfishness abounds in the human race, in but a small proportion does benevolence predominate, and but very imperfectly in the best of them. It is an humbling fact, attested by the universal history of the pagan world, that where men have made nature, whether externally or in themselves, their guide to the knowledge of God, they have made their gods not only like themselves, but to excel them, more in their corruptions and crimes than in their

virtues and graces.* Hence, too, in the ravings of their wild and bewildered speculations, some, from the distinctions of sex in the human race, have concluded the like to be in Deity, and taught the monstrous and impious absurdity to be traced in the legendary errors of a male and female duality in the godhead. Human reasoning and philosophy, so prone to consult analogy, have failed to discover the true nature and perfections of God. Even where the light of truth has shed its cheering rays, that light has been imprisoned. For "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."

The tendency of things, even at this advanced period of the world's history, is still to pantheism and idolatry, where men neglect the authoritative revelations of the Bible. In Germany, France, Switzerland, England, and our own country, among those by whom human reasonings and philosophy are made the supreme oracles, and the Scriptures are wrested from their plain common sense import, what lamentable and growing ignorance do we find of the true character of God; and how is the fact of "their foolish heart being darkened" proved by the pantheistic and atheistic absurdities advanced and advocated as the achievements of intellectual refinement, the noblest advances of an age of progress! Poets breathe their adorations, as did those of old, to God as the great soul of the universe. Philosophic divines deify man and humanize God, indifferently, by either process, to identify them! Vague idealities, attempts at lofty generalizations; subtle, unmeaning abstractions find favor; and whether it be materialistic or spiritual pantheism, that talks learnedly and philosophically about the universal essence, the eternal energy, the principle of motivity, &c., it is welcomed

* "Exposui fere non philosophorum judicia, sed delirantium somnia. Nec enim multo absurdiora sunt ea, quæ poetarum vocibus fusa, ipsa suavitate nocuerunt: qui et ira inflammatos, et libidine furentes induxerunt deos: feceruntque, ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus; odia præterea, dissidia, discordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effusas in omni intemperantia libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortalesque ex immortali procreatos."—*Cic. De Nat. Deorum.*

and honored by sceptics and infidels as a brilliant affair, if the universe be pronounced but the development of deity.

The personality of God—the fact that he is an intelligent, self-conscious Being, possessing moral character and maintaining a moral government,—is unwelcome to the unbelieving and sceptical mind, because alarming to the natural conscience. It is a relief to get rid of the scriptural idea of God as the lawgiver and judge, and every philosophical attempt of “rational divines” to deny his personal existence apart and separate from the creation, and to identify him with nature, is therefore greeted with applause! The earthly, the sensual, the selfish, and the evil of every class, will become religious, if the worship of nature and reverence for its laws be acknowledged as the worship of God. Nor will any be more popular and caressed than the priests in the temple of science, who may assume the task of offering the incense and oblations. Paganism and idolatry, of the worst description, cannot fail soon to spring up in such hotbeds of corruption as some schools of philosophy, which reject the plenary inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, have become. It is the happiness and the security of this land that we still possess the Bible, and circulate among the masses its plain and uncorrupted teachings. We shall no more know either the true nature or character of God than did the pagans, unless we learn them by believing his own revelation of himself in the sacred Scriptures.

Here we are taught the simple fact, that while, as to his essential nature, “God is a Spirit,” he is not a spirit like to, or identical with, any of the subtile and potent instrumental agencies in nature, however impalpable and invisible they may be. No electrical energy, nor magnetic power, nor stellar influence, nor seminal virtue, nor spiritual dynamics, with which blind philosophers may attempt to identify the essence of Deity, can ever explain the mysteries of his Being.

Should we ask “What is a spirit?”—so far as it relates to essential existence,—we cannot, by the highest effort of imagination, form a reply. The word, in its primary signification, means air, a subtile, invisible essence, possessing various attributes. But as applied to God, it is only used, by analogy, to designate his essential nature, as an invisible, in-

corruptible, personal, intelligent Being, possessing omnipotent energy and infinite moral excellence. Of his spiritual essence our senses cannot take direct cognizance. The blessed Redeemer has asserted the fact, that "no man hath at any time seen God," and hence the absolute necessity there is of our having some manifestation or revelation of him made to us. To talk about a spiritual intuition of God is but metaphysical nonsense. Man, the fallen child of fallen Adam, is utterly incompetent to frame any representation of him, or excogitate for himself any correct knowledge of his true nature. "The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, hath declared him." Every attempt to arrive at the knowledge of him, but through the teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is vain; it must ever prove ineffectual and lead to error. What can natural theology do without the aid of Revelation? The answer is found in the darkness, ignorance, idolatry, and corruption of the world.

Having the teachings of Jesus Christ, who is "himself" the image of the invisible God, and the only one God has ever allowed to fallen man, how absurd, as well as wicked, must it be to seek elsewhere for the knowledge of the Deity! Being man like ourselves, possessing, as it has been correctly stated, "a true body and a reasonable soul," partaking in common with us of our human nature, we are the better able, as we look to Christ, to give clearness to our conception of the Deity. We are not forced to think of him in our laboring minds, as of some vast, vague, indescribable, inconceivable essence. Conscious in the workings of our own spirit, of exercising some intelligent power, totally different from, and controlling, the material framework of our bodies; and regarding God in Christ as embodying himself in our nature; we are better enabled to form an idea of Deity, as an intelligent, personal Spirit. Were we left to grope, in all the mists and darkness of nature, after the great Spirit that "fills immensity with his presence," yet ever eludes the sight of our eyes and the grasp of our conceptions, we could never have the calm, rational, blissful communion with God which we can now have through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But here all the glories of the Godhead blazon forth upon our enraptured view; and in

communing "with the Father, through his Son, by the Holy Spirit," we feel that we have fellowship with real personal agents, intelligent subsistences, condescending to approach and make themselves known to us, if not in the mysteries of the divine Essence and Being, yet in such a way as to make it as easy to form a conception of God, who is a Spirit, as of the mind or spirit of the human friend whom we converse with and love. A thousand incidents and facts, and communications, and manifestations of purpose, will, and heart, recorded in the sacred Scriptures, unfold to us all we need to know of God, to direct and consummate the friendship and bliss of our fellowship with him. What if we can form no definite conception of his spiritual essence? Neither can we of the essential mind or spirit of an earthly friend. What if we cannot comprehend the personal subsistences so harmonious and united in the one essential Deity? There are mysteries in our own being, and in all nature around us. We cannot comprehend them, but being certified by their appropriate evidence, we cannot question them. Having the testimony of God himself in his own word, and from his lips, "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," we have the highest possible species of evidence. Faith reposes on it, and is blessed. Mind and heart alike are satisfied. While tossed, bewildered and unhappy, in attempts to give him locality, or to form any definite conception of him as a Spirit, in Christ we ever meet him, and rejoice to recognise him as our Father which is in heaven, and to look for the grace, help, and benefits he proffers, in and through the endeared relations he has assumed and sustains to the children of his adoption. Attempts at communion with God in nature, as the vast, almighty, majestic, everywhere present, invisible and inconceivable Spirit, prove utterly inefficacious to tranquillize the guilty conscience, or to give comfort to the troubled heart. Indeed, more than half the effort made to commune with God through nature depends upon the imagination. A poetic fancy conduces much to such devotion; but often its fire is as strange and unlike that kindled by the breathings of the Spirit of Christ, as was the fervor of the pagan polytheists, who personified every fountain, river, tree, and living object, as outward forms of their deities. For guilty, fallen, ruined man, nature

speaks not one cheering or forgiving word. An awful silence reigns, and overwhelming darkness inspires us with horror, whenever we attempt to consult her oracles as to whether a righteous God can pardon the rebellious. But when we turn with believing mind to the sure word of God, the broken heart is healed; the guilty conscience is cleansed, and reconciliation being accomplished by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, no barrier forbids a free access, but the joyous heart exults and ever finds fresh delight in the discoveries faith makes of the boundless grace, compassion, and glory of him whom to know is life eternal.

How invaluable, therefore, is the word of God! And how little is or can be gained either to the cause of truth or piety, by exalting nature, and its dim light, as a means of religious knowledge and improvement, to the neglect or undervaluing of the sacred Scriptures. Commendations of natural religion are but compromises with infidelity.

How dangerous, too, to attempt any sensible or imaginative representation of God! He has absolutely prohibited it. Some even of the ancient heathen have set a better example than many professing Christians in this respect. Pythagoras forbade his pupils to engrave any image of him. The ancient Romans for 170 years worshipped without any material representations of Deity. So did the ancient Germans. So do our Indian tribes. As it is impossible even to imagine the divine similitude, every effort of the sort must fail, and tend to degrade the conception of God. "To whom," saith Jehovah, "will ye liken me?" Can they truly believe that Jesus Christ is God, and obey the letter and spirit of the second commandment, who yet attempt and favor material representations of him? Just as Rationalism and Romanism undervalue the Scriptures, and obscure the knowledge of the true God, the taste and tendency of the times become favorable to idols. Publishers and venders of books are led to cater to the corrupt taste. Even Protestants sometimes account it a pious procedure to commend their editions of the Bible and other publications, by pictorial representations as unbecoming the worship of the true God as were "the idols of the house of Israel portrayed upon the wall." As the sensible representation becomes current, the spiritual

idea of God cannot fail to be impaired. Faith is not fancy, nor can it be even aided by it.

How carefully and faithfully, therefore, should the ministers of Christ watch and guard their hearers against the dangerous ways in which multitudes are diverging from the simple faith of God's word. Whether it be by the theatrical process and pageantry of Romanism and ritual forms, which like the drama appeal to and gratify the senses and the fancy; or, by the subtle rationalism of transcendental philosophy, which undermines the authority of the Scriptures by claiming for itself a similar inspiration, infidelity is waging war against the gospel of the grace of God. It is in the church that the leaven works the greatest evil, and the danger is most imminent, that many "being led astray by the error of the wicked will fall from their steadfastness." Every method and device to teach the knowledge of God, which substitutes sense or reason for faith, and leads the inquirer elsewhere than to the sure word of his testimony, is from the father of lies, and cannot but prove fatal to evangelical piety. The God of the rationalist, the pantheist, the pagan, and the papal idolater, is but the form they have portrayed in the chambers of their imagery, and not the God who hath revealed himself in the Scriptures, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and it is essential to our character and name as Christians, that we hold and declare with the apostle, "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true; even in his Son Jesus Christ. THIS IS THE TRUE GOD AND ETERNAL LIFE."

ART. IV.—DR. SPRING'S DISCOURSES ON THE MILLENNIUM.

THE GLORY OF CHRIST, Illustrated in his Character and History, including The Last Things of his Mediatorial Government. By Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church. Two volumes. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852.

BY THE EDITOR.

THIS work consists of Discourses—now changed into

chapters—that were delivered by Dr. Spring, in a series. It will probably strike most who read it attentively, as singular that he should have introduced into a treatise on such a subject, an attack like that in his fifteenth chapter, on those who regard the Scriptures as teaching that Christ's second advent is to take place antecedently to the millennium. It is in entire deviation, both in its aim and spirit, from the other Discourses. They are not controversial. They are employed in a direct statement of the views he derives from the Scriptures of Christ's nature, character, work, and reign; and so far from having exhausted those subjects, he has passed several of the most important of them in silence. There is no exhibition given by him of Christ's representative office, or substitution in the place of men. There is no formal discussion of the great subject of his expiation. There are only casual allusions to it. There is none of the office of his sacrifice and obedience in the justification of men. There is scarcely an allusion to his work as the intercessor of his people. Why should he have omitted all these and other great questions, the treatment of which is indispensable to a just exhibition of the Redeemer's work and glory, and stepped aside to assail a large body of evangelical believers in this country and Great Britain, as respectable in talents, learning, and piety, occupying positions as honorable, and exerting as wide and useful an influence as any others,—many of them belonging to the same denomination as himself, and some of them members of the same synod and presbytery? Though he had far greater reason for it, he has not taken such a course in regard to any other theme. It is not in any degree a peculiarity that different views are entertained by theologians and others respecting Christ's coming and reign. There is not a topic treated by him, in regard to which quite as dissimilar and contradictory opinions are not entertained. There is not one, indeed, in respect to which there are not doctrines taught that subvert what he holds to be the most essential truths. Why, then, has he left so many fundamental questions belonging to his general theme unnoticed, and made an assault on a doctrine which is not considered generally, even by those who dissent from it, as a heresy, nor made a test of orthodoxy; which is held, and has been for ages, by some of the greatest as

well as the best of men ; and which is indisputably sustained by a great body of Scriptural evidence ? Why has he not merely controverted that doctrine, but assailed those who entertain it, and presented misrepresentations of their views, that impeach their principles, and are adapted to render them objects of suspicion and prejudice ? That such is the character of his attack, no candid person who reads it, whatever may be his views of the period of Christ's coming, can fail to see. What then is the reason of this singular procedure ? We leave our readers to judge, when they shall have perused the observations we are to offer on his representations and reasonings. They will not, improbably, be led to suspect that it sprang from a motive that does not openly appear—that the object to be accomplished by it is quite aside from that which is avowed.

But if the introduction of the subject into the volume is singular and ill judged, the method in which he has chosen to treat it is still more so. Although the question between him and those whom he assails turns on the testimony of the Scriptures, he declines to test it by them, and makes his own preconceived opinions the standard by which it is to be tried. Thus he says,—

“ There are two ways of refuting the manifold errors of this strange system. The one is by a patient and critical examination of the passages of Scripture which are relied on for its support. *This is too tedious a process for such a work as that to which these pages are devoted ; nor could it be interesting to the great mass of readers.* This has been done, and ably and conclusively done, already. The other method is to bring the theory to the test of *those acknowledged principles and truths of the Gospel*, with which it is at variance.” Vol. ii. pp. 107, 108.

But if it was too tedious a process to refute the system by a critical consideration of the passages of Scripture which are relied on for its support, he should not have undertaken to discuss it. That is a very extraordinary reason, truly, for setting aside the word of God, and substituting his authority in its place ! What a convenient method of settling a great question ! How excellently adapted to those who have no other means of establishing a point than to beg what they affect to prove, or assume that their opinions are

the standard by which the meaning of the Scriptures is to be determined, and the truth of doctrines decided. For that is the real import of the method he proposes of settling the question;—"those acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel with which" he represents "the system" as "at variance," being nothing else than *his own opinions*. Such,—declining as he does a direct reference to the word of God,—they must naturally and necessarily be; and such the statement he proceeds to give of them shows that they are.

Thus the first of them, which he states and makes a test of the doctrine he assails, is nothing more nor less than his judgment respecting "*the principle*" on which *millenarians found their system*; and a judgment, as we shall soon show, that, instead of being just, is at the very antipodes of truth. "That principle," he says, "is the law of a rigidly literal interpretation,* than which nothing can be more preposterous." Such a law would undoubtedly be sufficiently absurd; but not quite so preposterous as the proposition he here advances,—as his two statements united constitute the extraordinary affirmation that it is one of the "*acknowledged truths of the gospel*" that "the great principle which" the millenarian "theory" "assumes in its interpretation of the Scriptures on this subject" "is the law of rigidly literal interpretation!" But if that is a truth of the gospel, then the gospel must specifically mention that system. If it is an acknowledged truth of the gospel that that is the system of millenarians, and that it is founded on that law of interpretation, then it must be *acknowledged by theologians generally* that the gospel exhibits that as their system, and declares that they found it on that "law of rigidly literal interpretation." For if such is not the fact, how can it be one of the "acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel" that such is their law? Into what an exquisite complication of absurdities and contradictions Dr. S. thus precipitates himself at his first step, in order to escape "the tedious process" of confuting millenarianism by "a critical examination of

* "Our first objection against this theory then is, that the great principle which it assumes in its interpretation of the Scriptures on this subject, is a false principle. That principle is the law of rigidly literal interpretation."—Vol. ii. p. 109.

the passages of Scripture which are relied on for its support!" And what a brilliant display he makes of the critical powers that are requisite to such an examination! Who now can fail to see that this imagined "acknowledged principle and truth of the gospel," by which he affects to demonstrate the error of the premillennial doctrine, is nothing else than his own preconceived and false opinion respecting it? Such he himself must admit it to be; as otherwise he will be compelled to acknowledge that that doctrine is the genuine doctrine of the word of God. He certainly cannot produce any passage from the Scriptures that directly pronounces it to be an error. If, therefore, as he implies, the gospel expressly mentions it, and states what the law of interpretation is on which it is founded, and the statement of that law as the law of the system, is one of the "acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel," then that system and law must of course be themselves among the truths of the gospel; and Dr. Spring accordingly, instead of confuting, vindicates those whom he assails, and overthrows himself.

The second proposition which he advances as an "acknowledged principle and truth of the gospel," that "the theory" "obscures the spirituality of Christ's kingdom," is also of the same character. Here, again, there is in effect an affirmation that the gospel makes express mention of that theory, and charges it with obscuring the spirituality of Christ's kingdom: for if it contains no such charge nor mention, how can they be among its acknowledged principles and truths? But if Dr. S. is justified in his statement, why did he not produce the passages that verify it? It would not have been "too tedious a process for such a work" as his to have quoted half a dozen texts; nor could it have failed to be "interesting to the great mass of readers." We can assure him that, had he given notice through the papers that he was to produce a class of such passages, he would have aroused a far higher curiosity than the advertisements with which he favored the public awakened; and the critical process by which they were shown to teach what he declares to be an acknowledged principle and truth of the gospel, would have been read with a thousand times the interest his present volume can excite. Who could be indifferent on the announcement of such a novelty? Who could have been

withheld from acknowledging and celebrating the genius displayed in such an extraordinary discovery? But can anything be more preposterous than the fancy that the Scriptures contain such an annunciation? Can anything be plainer than that what he denominates an acknowledged principle and truth of the gospel, is nothing else than his own mere opinion: that to claim for it any other rank, is an affront to his readers, of which he would have been incapable had he caught but a glimpse of the true import of his propositions?

Such is the character also of what he alleges as his third acknowledged principle and truth of the gospel;—that “this theory . . . gives undue and unwarranted influence to the mere personal presence of Christ in the conversion of the world.” This also implies that the gospel presents a direct affirmation to that effect: for if it does not, how can that statement be one of its “acknowledged principles and truths?” But what can transcend the error of representing the word of God as uttering such a charge? Instead, it is Dr. Spring’s mere *opinion* on the subject, which he has foisted in the place of that word, and made the test by which the doctrine of the premillennial advent is to be judged.

So also of his other “acknowledged principles and truths” which he alleges as demonstrating the error of the theory;—“that it denies the general judgment and the final destruction of this material world;” and “that it is inconsistent with the Scriptural narrative of those events which are to take place between the millennium and the end of the world.” No one needs to be told that the Bible contains no such declarations respecting the doctrine held by millenarians in regard to Christ’s advent; that they have no place among its “acknowledged principles and truths.” His representations are so preposterous as to render it a matter of astonishment that he should have advanced them. He has plainly mistaken *his own notions* for the testimony of the Bible, and made them the criteria of the doctrine he assails, in place of “the passages of Scripture which are relied on for its support.”

Such is the extraordinary method he takes to discredit and confute the doctrine of Christ’s premillennial advent. The word of God is in effect unceremoniously discarded,

under the plea, that to demonstrate from that what he wishes to establish, would be "too tedious a process," and could not be "interesting to the great mass of readers;" and substitutes his own preconceived notions in its place, pronounces them the "acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel," and makes them the test by which he judges those whom he assails: and this solemn part is enacted with the professed purpose of illustrating the character, history, and glory of Christ! It is in a most unfortunate attitude truly that he thus presents himself:—in a most unenviable light that he places the alarm he feels at the doctrine he so passionately denounces;—the discourtesy he exhibits towards those whom he opposes; the zeal he displays for the truth, and the unusual expedients—advertisements, notices, and puffs—that were employed to draw the attention of the public, gather a crowd at the delivery of his Discourses, and excite a curiosity at the publication of the volume, which, apart from its fifteenth chapter, it has little adaptation to awaken. What judgment would be formed of men in other professions who should pursue such a course? What would be thought of a lawyer who, in attempting before a court to convict a person of a crime, should decline to produce any statute prohibiting the action charged as a violation of law, and make his own opinion, irrespective of legal enactments, the criterion by which persons are to be judged guilty of criminal offences? What would be thought of a judge who should refuse to decide a great legal question by the statutes, which it is his business to expound and administer, as "too tedious a process" for his office, and make his own preconceived notions and prejudices the rule of his judgment? What estimate would be formed of a merchant who, in the purchase or sale of commodities, should refuse to determine the quantities by the legalized weights and measures, and claim the right to fix them by his own arbitrary dictum? But would such a procedure be any more lawless and reprehensible in them, or more incompatible with the rights of those whose interests their conduct affected, than the course is Dr. S. has taken in making his mere opinion the criterion of the truth on the subject of Christ's second coming? What method could be devised more directly adapted to discredit the sacred office, and make religion the object of ridicule?

What higher right has he to substitute his mere dictum in the place of the Bible, and make it the test of revealed truth, than Dr. Bushnell, Professor Park, Theodore Parker, the disciples of Swedenborg, Bishop Hughes, or any others? What doctrine of the word of God is secure, whose character is safe if such a procedure is allowable?

But it will perhaps be said, that though Dr. S. has, so unluckily for himself and the cause he has attempted to advocate, made his own opinions the standard by which the doctrine he assails is to be judged, yet it must undoubtedly have happened through inadvertence. He cannot have intended to set aside the word of God, and substitute his notions or dictum in its place. He should be regarded, therefore, as having fallen unconsciously into the mistake, though a very sad one, and as such it should be overlooked. Let it be so; and what we then ask is merely that this consideration should have its proper effect on the estimate and influence of his opinions. It cannot but be felt that judgments and denunciations proceeding from one who is involved in such an extraordinary misapprehension have but little title to respect. It will be acknowledged that there can be but very slight qualifications to discuss a question, where there is so singular an inacquaintance with its first elements. It will be admitted that there is very little delicacy and modesty in speaking authoritatively on a topic where there is such an inability to distinguish between mere notions and prejudices, and the acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel.

But notwithstanding the extraordinary expedient by which he attempts to confute the doctrines held by millenarians, it will perhaps be asked: May it not be after all that the objections which he alleges against the system are legitimate, and prove it in a measure at least to be erroneous? Not at all, we answer. He has misapprehended them as sadly as he has misconceived himself. He has misrepresented their doctrine, as strangely as he has misjudged his own. This will be seen from an examination of his objections.

"Our first objection against this theory, then, is, that *the great principle which it assumes in its interpretation of the Scriptures on this subject is a false principle.* That principle is the law of rigidly

literal interpretation, than which nothing can be more preposterous. All agree that the Scriptures ought to be so interpreted as to express the mind of their Author, and the sense which the writers of them intended to convey. If the sacred writers were inspired, they cannot be inconsistent with themselves. . . . The simplest interpretation, and that which presents itself most naturally to the mind, is often that which regards the passage as purely symbolical or figurative. It may require great art and subtlety, and great research, in order to justify a literal interpretation of some passages on the subject of the millennium; while the true import of the figures and symbols they contain is discovered with perfect facility. 'The true sense is the necessary sense,' and we only wonder, when we come to perceive it, that we did not perceive it before. *There are passages which, if literally interpreted, would go the whole length of the statement we have already given of the premillennial advent; but the question is, is the literal construction the fair and true construction? or do they require some other construction, demanded by the subject, and which must necessarily be adopted, in order to make the sacred writers consistent with themselves?* To affirm a literal construction of those passages which are professedly contained in the most figurative and symbolical books of the Scriptures, would go far towards destroying all the fixed laws of sound interpretation. That would be to make prose of poetry, and hold imagery as though it were doctrinal statement. No sober man would interpret such passages as he would interpret a law, a deed, a contract, or a last will and testament. To do so would be a perversion of language, and an outrage upon common sense and common honesty. The true principle of interpreting the word of God, so far as the question of literal construction is concerned, is to interpret those passages literally, *which their authors designed should be so interpreted.* Enthusiasm and fanaticism would have nothing to restrain them, if allowed to put a literal construction upon those parts of the Bible which the Holy Spirit never designed should receive such a construction. . . .

"It is easy to affirm that the prophetic and apocalyptic writings, which speak of the millennium, are free from figures and symbols, and are altogether literal. Yet on this mere ASSUMPTION, rests the whole hypothesis of the premillennial advent. The strength of this argument lies in this rigid and literal interpretation, while the propriety of such an interpretation has nothing in the world to support it, but the strength with which it is repeatedly asserted. . . .

"The literal construction of this subject is the most arbitrary construction in the world. Such a view of human language as this theory adopts, is incompatible with the very design of language.

They are most certainly mistaken views which result from them; nor is there any end to the mistakes which have been made in resorting to the doctrine of literal construction. If the nature of the subject, the object of the sacred writers, their consistency with themselves, and the analogy of faith, have anything to do in interpreting the Scriptures, the arbitrary law of literal construction must be given up. Nor is there any intimation in any of the Scriptural descriptions of the millennial glory of the Son of God, that the language is to be thus literally understood. We have read labored dissertations on the laws of symbols and metaphors; we have observed the impatience their authors manifest because the Christian world does not bow to their dictation; we have noticed with some surprise the indecorous epithets with which they stigmatize those who differ from them, as unlearned and ignorant men; but we have not found their system supported by the Bible. More especially in its application to the supposed premillennial advent of Christ, it is unsupported by a single proof text, a single declaration of the Scriptures, which, if properly explained, does not sustain the opposite doctrine."—Vol. ii. pp. 109–117.

He thus alleges in the most specific and positive manner that the whole ground on which the doctrine he assails is founded, is "the false principle of *rigidly literal interpretation*;" that the advocates of that doctrine "*affirm that the prophetic and apocalyptic writings which speak of the millennium are free from figures and symbols, and are altogether literal*;" and that "*on this mere assumption rests the whole hypothesis of the premillennial advent*." There are no restrictive clauses whatever in these assertions; there is no limitation to this charge. In order, however, to perceive its full import, it must be seen what the particular constructions are which millenarians—were they to proceed on such a law—would put on the two great classes of symbolical and language prophecies. He declares, then, that they absolutely deny the existence of symbols in the prophetic writings? His meaning, therefore, must be either that they deny that there are any symbols in the prophecies of Daniel, John, and others; or in other words that any mention is made in their prophecies of an image, a great tree, wild beasts, candlesticks, horsemen, a burning mountain, locusts, angels, and other representative agents and objects; or else that they deny that those agents and objects are the medium of representing the

agents and events that are foreshown. Whichever it may be, did a more groundless and monstrous misrepresentation ever proceed from the pen of an accuser?

The other branch of the charge is still more flagrantly unjust,—as it represents millenarians not only as running into the most absurd errors, but as guilty of the most revolting blasphemies: for to affirm that the prophetic writings are free from figures, is equivalent to asserting that there are no figures in those passages, for example, respecting the renovation of the mind by the Spirit, in which the terms begotten again, born again, regeneration, renewing, and others of the kind are used; and affirming that they are to be interpreted as denoting the natural generation and birth of the body, from which those metaphors are drawn; for that, if there are no figures in them, must be their meaning. His accusation in effect therefore is, that they hold *that it is the body and not the mind that is the subject of regeneration*. His representation is in like manner, that they affirm that there are no figures in those passages in which redeem, ransom, bought, purchased, redemption, and other similar terms are used to denote the salvation of men by Christ, and hold that they signify that he accomplishes their deliverance by giving an equivalent for them in property, as was done in the redemption of captives and slaves from bondage, from which those figures are derived; for that, if there are no figures in them, must be their meaning. So also his accusation is, that they hold that there are no figures in the passages in which metaphors drawn from physical objects are applied to God; and maintain that those tropical terms are used literally, and denote precisely what they do when applied to objects to which they properly belong;—that when, accordingly, it is affirmed that God is a shield, the signification is that he is literally a material implement, made of skins, wood, or metal, used in war, of which that term is the usual and proper denominative; that when he is declared to be a rock, the fact affirmed is, that he is a mineral mass such as that word is ordinarily used to denote; and so of such expressions as God is a tower, a fortress, a fire. His representation is equivalent therefore to the charge that instead of a self-existent and infinite intelligence, God is a mere finite, material, and unconscious existence, immea-

surably inferior in nature and rank to many of his creatures. And so of other metaphorical expressions. There is not a solitary truth of natural or revealed religion, but his statement represents millenarians as boldly and unequivocally denying! A more grave and comprehensive accusation could scarcely have been embodied in language.

What now are we to think of these astonishing representations? Is Dr. S. so unacquainted with the subject as not to be aware that they cannot be true,—as not to know, with the clearest certainty, that they have not a particle of ground for their support,—that they are so palpably and enormously wrong as to render him inexcusable in uttering them, and especially under the pretence of illustrating the character and glory of Christ? He, however, resents the intimation that such misstatements have their origin in a want of knowledge. He repels the appropriation of such epithets as “unlearned and ignorant” to those who have before put forth gross misrepresentations of the principles and doctrines held by millenarians, as “indecorous,” and branding them with an unmerited stigma. But if he is not to be allowed the plea of ignorance, to what are we to ascribe these accusations that carry on their front the most palpable proofs of their falsehood? That he was animated by a very uncandid spirit; that he was ambitious of a piquant exhibition of the subject; that if he succeeded in making an effective onset on those whom he attacked, excited a prejudice against them, and drew expressions of applause from a circle of partisans that should be repeated through the country, and give currency to his volume, he thought little of anything else, may be deemed possible without supposing him to have been consciously unjust. But how, without an impeachment of his uprightness, are his misrepresentations to be accounted for, on the assumption that he was fully aware of their character? It seems to us that the reference of such errors to ignorance, inconsideration, or some similar defect, instead of being indecorous or unfair, is an act of generousness and courtesy.

That his representations, so far as we are concerned, are the very converse of fact, our readers cannot need to be told; and they will agree with us that to one not wholly unaware of the import of his language, it required some nerve to rise

in the presence of a large audience, and with a special reference to us, declare, and afterwards send the declaration forth from the press, to meet the eyes, perhaps, of hundreds who are familiar with our pages, that millenarians "*affirm that the prophetic and apocalyptic writings which speak of the millennium, ARE FREE FROM FIGURES AND SYMBOLS, and are altogether literal.*" in other words, that they, and we among them, formally deny the existence both of figures and symbols, in the prophetic and apocalyptic writings; and that on this mere *assumption* rests the whole hypothesis of the premillennial advent! Could he possibly have framed a proposition more absolutely and palpably in contradiction to fact? Had it been his object at one blow for ever to divest his testimony of all title to reliance, could he have chosen an expedient more adapted to the purpose? All who are in any measure acquainted with our course, know that so far from denying that there are any symbols in the Pentateuch, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, and John, it has been one of our principal objects to unfold their great characteristics, and state, verify, and apply their laws; and that in order to that, we have given an enumeration of the whole series of them in the Scriptures, defined their several classes, produced examples of the interpretation in the prophecies in which they occur, of one or more of each class; in the induction of the principle on which they are to be expounded, have proceeded expressly on those interpretations, which give the laws they involve the rank and authority of direct revelations; and finally, that so far as they are concerned, it is by the interpretation of the symbols of Daniel ii. 31-45, vii. 13-28, Apocalypse xix. 11-21, and other passages, by those laws, that we deduce the doctrine of Christ's second coming anterior to the millennium. These facts are known very generally in the Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, Lutheran, Baptist, and Methodist denominations, and in the principal theological seminaries and colleges; while the views we have advanced have engaged, it is well understood, the earnest consideration of a large number of professional and cultivated persons, have commanded the assent of many, and have not been publicly controverted so far as we are aware, nor denounced, except by parties, who, like Dr. S., betray either such defects of knowledge or

such party biasses as to divest their judgment of authority. And to this, Dr. S. himself is no stranger; having read, as he expressly indicates in this discourse, the principal discussions in the *Journal* on the subject. How, then, is it that in the face of these facts he ventures to declare, and spreads the declaration wherever his volume finds its way, that we deny that there are any symbols whatever "in the prophetic and apocryphical writings," and "that on this mere assumption rests the whole hypothesis of the premillennial advent?" What explanation can be given of this extraordinary procedure? Is he still involved in such a misapprehension of the subject as not to be aware that his statement is in contradiction to facts so indisputable and notorious that his own party will regard it with astonishment and reprobation? Does he innocently think that such an expedient is justifiable for the confutation of millenarianism? Does he persuade himself that any measures are vindicable by which the advocates of that doctrine can be divested of their influence, and made objects of aversion? Is this a specimen of *the spirituality* which he regards as the great characteristic of Christ's disciples? Is this the method by which he expects to illustrate his character and glory?

So far as he refers to us, his assertion that millenarians deny the existence of figures in the prophetic and apocryphical writings, is, in like manner, in the most palpable contradiction to fact. So far from holding that there are no figures in those writings, next to determining and applying the laws of symbols, our special aim has been to unfold the principles of tropical language, and apply them to the exposition of the Scriptures. For that purpose we have pointed out the peculiarities that distinguish figures from literal expressions; defined their several species; stated their laws; applied them in all our expositions of passages in which figures occur; given an enumeration of their whole series in several of the chapters of *Isaiah*, and presented the results to which they lead. And the views we have advanced, it is well known, have attracted a good deal of attention, are regarded very generally by those who have carefully examined them, as indisputably just, and have not been publicly controverted, except by Professor Bush, who nevertheless admits their truth and authority, so far forth as language is to be inter-

preted by the laws of philology. It is only in reference to a supposed representative or symbolical office of the agents and objects mentioned in passages, of which language is not the medium, that he sets them aside.

How now is it that with these facts before him, and without a shadow of anything to justify his denial of them, Dr. Spring boldly declares to his readers that millenarians, and we especially among them, "*affirm* that the prophetic and apocalyptical writings which speak of the millennium, are **FREE** from figures, and altogether literal." Can it be that he is so little familiar with the nature of figures, that he has wholly mistaken the subject of discussion, and by some unfortunate process, appropriated their name to some other peculiarities real or imaginary of language? How else is his utterance of a misrepresentation so enormous, and so certain to recoil on himself, to be explained?

His representation—though perhaps made with a special reference to ourselves—is as devoid of truth also and as unjust in respect to millenarians generally, as it is to us. What can transcend the error of asserting that they deny that there are any symbols in the prophetic Scriptures! Let him produce a passage from them, if he can, to verify the accusation. He might with as much color of truth, and as much credit to himself, assert that they do not regard the Scriptures as a revelation; that they do not believe either in a second advent or a millennium; that they have never written a syllable on the subject. Why did he not, in order to despatch the affair at a single stroke, affirm that there are no millenarians whatever; that the doctrine of Christ's coming before the thousand years, is so groundless and preposterous that no human being has yet been found sufficiently ignorant and infatuated to believe it? It would have been quite as consistent with fact, and would have reflected quite as much credit on his intelligence and candor. No millenarian denies or sets aside the symbols of the Scriptures. They universally recognise them; they have labored immensely to unfold their true meaning; have written a great number of expositions of them; and have founded on them, in a measure, their belief of Christ's premillennial advent. We should not have thought it possible that any one could have ventured to deny it.

It is an equally stark and startling misrepresentation to charge them with asserting that there are no figures in the prophetic writings. Who of them has uttered such an affirmation? Did the English and Scotch reformers, who looked for Christ's reign on the earth during the millennium? Did the Westminster divines? Did Mr. Mede, or Sir Isaac Newton? Has Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Bickersteth, Mr. M'Neil, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Bonar, or any one of the great number in Great Britain who have written on the subject during the last fifty years? Has Dr. Duffield, Bishop Henshaw, Judge Jones, Mr. Lillie, Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Newton, Mr. Imbrie, Dr. Lord of Dartmouth, or any of the pre-millennialists in this country, who have made known their opinions through the pulpit or press? All who have any acquaintance with their views know there is not the slightest ground for such an accusation—that it is in the boldest and most absolute contradiction to the fact. They all recognise the existence of figures in the prophetic writings. They all hold that they are to be interpreted as such, according to their several natures, and they all in a measure found their belief in the reign of Christ on the earth during the thousand years, on such an interpretation of the figures in the predictions of that period. They have no inducement whatever to deny the existence of figures in the prophecies of that reign. Instead of strengthening it would weaken their cause. There is not an individual among them we presume, who would desire, as far as the language prophecies are concerned, any more effective means of establishing the doctrine of Christ's advent anterior to the millennium, and confuting anti-millennarianism, than their interpretation by the true laws of language; those parts of them in which there are no figures, literally according to their philological meaning; and those expressions in them that are figurative, according to the principles on which their figures are used. And no conviction we believe is more common to them, than that such an exposition of those predictions would be fatal to the whole system of post-millennialism.

The term *Literalist*—which some of them have chosen to adopt as a denominative—a term we are not accustomed to use—is not employed by them to indicate that they deny the existence of figures in the prophecies, and universally assign

an unfigurative signification to their language; but is used simply to distinguish themselves from those interpreters called *spiritualists*—of whom Dr. Spring is one—who do not confine themselves to the laws of philology in the explication of the principal prophecies of the future, nor admit that the presence of specific figures is necessary to constitute them figurative; but arbitrarily ascribe that character to many of them, irrespective of the forms of language in which they are expressed, and claim that, aside from their grammatical sense, the persons, places, acts, and events mentioned in them, have a representative or allegorical office, and are the medium of their proper, prophetic meaning. We might quote a multitude of passages confirming this statement. It will be enough to present a few. Thus Mr. Irving says:—

“It is a question which, after fourteen hundred years, is again brought into public and open issue before the whole church, concerning the literal accomplishment of every jot and tittle of the law and the prophets. . . . It is a question purely of interpretation, resolving itself into the simple issue, whether God’s word is to be interpreted *after the same manner and by the same rules, as the word of any man*; whether the Holy Scriptures are to be understood according to the way of understanding another book, *by the natural meaning of the words, SIMILITUDES, METAPHORS, AND OTHER FIGURES which are employed therein.* We, who stand up for *literal interpretation*, hold that it ought to be so interpreted and understood; and only with the more diligent and exact study of the language, because it is the word of God. Therefore we would examine every jot and tittle, because we know that ‘one jot or tittle shall not pass from the Prophets till all be fulfilled.’ *A figure of speech*, we hold, *should be treated as a figure of speech is elsewhere treated*; an emblem as an emblem, a symbol as a symbol; all in order to come at the real thing which the word seeketh to express. . . . The only way, we maintain, by which the real thing intended to be made known can be known, is through the exact, honest, and common sense interpretation of THE WORDS in which it is made known. . . .

“To suppose, with Origen and his followers, that there are subtle and recondite senses in the text of Holy Writ, is not only to degrade the understanding of man, as we see it degraded in the Rabbinical writers, and to introduce those Gnostic aberrations which misled the Christian church in the primitive ages; but it is really to strike at a higher mark, even at God himself; and to suppose that in revealing

his mind to man, he adopted a cypher which few might attain unto by erudition, or obtain the secret of by revelation, but from which the many should be for ever hidden, or, at least, until some of the illuminated ones should disclose to them the matter. . . .

"These remarks I make with the view of introducing what I take to be an unexceptionable method of bringing the great question concerning the literal,"—that is the philological—"interpretation of prophecy to a fair and final determination. The method is simply this—to take the Holy Ghost as our guide; who in the New Testament hath directed us to the application of a great number of the prophecies of the Old Testament, expressly declaring in most instances, that in such an event was such and such a word of prophecy fulfilled. . . . By taking this infallible guidance, we have no doubt that we shall be able to make it appear, that in every instance God interprets literally his own blessed Word;"—that is, according to the ordinary laws of the language in which it is expressed—"and this I think occurring in well nigh, if not more than, an hundred instances, will prove warrant enough for every wise and pious man to conclude that his word ought ever to be interpreted literally."—*Interpretations of Old Test. Prophecies*, pp. 13–17.

"Prophecy, like all other Scripture, is to be literally interpreted. By this it is not meant that figures are excluded; but only that that sense is to be affixed which would first and at once suggest itself to a simple mind; and that figures exist only where the context makes their presence clear, as in passages not prophetic. And this rule springs from the reflection that God's words were given to be understood. . . .

"A difference between a symbol and a figure may be noticed. *All language is full of figures* which convey the meaning quite as accurately as plain expressions, and much more forcibly. A symbol is an emblematic or allegorical sign; a purposely designed picture, using things universally known to convey knowledge to our minds. . . .

The meaning, however, of symbols is made yet clearer by literal interpretations. Thus we are informed that candlesticks mean churches; the woman, Rev. xvii. 18, means the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.—*Bickersteth's Guide to the Prophecies*, pp. 97–99.

"We now pass to notice another principle to be observed in the interpretation of prophecy, and that is *the adherence to the literal signification* of the words of the text in all cases, unless there be some clear intimation in the text or context, or some warrant from the general use of particular phrases, to the contrary.

"Very important considerations are involved in this matter. It seems to be a device of Satan, when he cannot hope to lead men altogether from the faith of Scripture, to become 'an angel of light,' and in that character to lead men to some subtlety in the way of the interpretation or the application of Scripture, which virtually renders it useless; and among these modes is that of setting the ingenuity to work to find out what is called a *spiritual* meaning in sentences and expressions where the Holy Ghost probably never intended it. Such interpretations may be justifiable in the way of an accommodated and secondary sense, provided they be not allowed in any way to interfere with or to supersede the literal; but if they be allowed to become unwarrantably the primary sense, they then have practically the effect of drawing off our attention from the real instruction which the Holy Spirit designs to give us, and thus of rendering void the word of God. And if once the principle is conceded that men may discard the literal sense, and that it is the sign of superior spirituality of mind to fetch out of the words of Scripture some recondite or mystical signification, where are we to draw the line, and how is it possible to lay down any rules to prevent the wit and ingenuity of man from running into extravagance? The Israelite who, before the coming of Christ, should have imposed a spiritual meaning on those passages of prophecy which foretell that he should be born of a virgin, that he should ride on an ass, that he should be spit upon and put to death, would as effectually have diverted attention from the truth contained in these words, as the Cabbalists do who make the sense to depend on the combination of particular words, letters, and numbers. And so likewise, if men are to spiritualize the things which regard Christ's *second* coming, what should hinder us from adopting at once the *allegorical style* of Origen, which is nevertheless so generally spoken against? For all is in such case reduced to uncertainty, it depends upon the liveliness or the dulness of the expositor's imagination; and so long as he offers not a sense plainly repugnant to the doctrines of the word of God in general, there appears no sufficient reason why the followers of Origen and the Jewish Cabbalists should not be just as much admired."—*Brooks's Elements of Prophetic Interpretation*, pp. 129–131.

"Two very different, and, in some respects, antagonistical systems"—of interpretation—"are and have been for centuries adopted by commentators. They may be designated the *literal* and the *spiritual*. By the *literal*, we understand that which assumes the literality or historical reality of the events predicted, and resorts to the grammatical interpretation of the language of prophecy to determine its meaning. By the *spiritual*, we understand that

which assumes *the spirituality of the events predicted*," that is—that they are of a different kind from those which the language grammatically denotes. "It traces something *analogous*, it may be, to the literal, but entirely different from it, and peculiar, of which the literal may be employed as *the representative or allegorical exhibition*."—*Duffield's Dissertation on the Prophecies*, p. 34.

There is thus no denial by these writers—who may be taken as expressing the views of millenarians generally—that there are figures in the prophetic Scriptures, or intimation that such as occur in them are not to be interpreted as though they were figures. They formally recognise the existence of tropical expressions in the predictions that respect the millennium, and maintain that they are to be construed as such, according to their proper laws. The terms literal and literally are used by them, accordingly, as synonymous with grammatical and philological, to signify simply that the language prophecies are to be interpreted by the laws of philology, and held to foreshow those events exclusively which the words in which they are expressed, taken in their grammatical sense, indicate. And the system they oppose, is that of *the spiritualists or allegorists*, who reject the philological sense of the prophecies, discard the language in which they are conveyed as the medium of the revelation that is made through them, and hold that, as in parables, allegories, and symbolic visions, the persons, things, or events of which they treat, are the instruments of the predictions which they embody, and denote other agents, objects, and events of a different nature or class from themselves. This monstrous system—introduced by Origen and others of the Alexandrian school in the third century—was invented for the express purpose of expunging from the Scriptures whatever was at variance with their philosophical speculations, and especially of setting aside the doctrine of the creation and fall, redemption by Christ's sacrifice, his second coming and personal reign, the restoration of the Israelites, the renovation of the earth, the resurrection of the body, and others that were not known to the Platonic philosophy. It was accordingly used as the great instrument of assailing and confuting chiliasm by Origen, Dyonisius of Alexandria, Jerome, and others, in that and the following

centuries, and has been through every age to the present hour. It is on that that the whole fabric of anti-millenarianism rests for its support. Let it be discarded, and the prophecies that are made through language be interpreted exclusively by the laws of philology, and those of which symbols are the medium interpreted by the laws of symbols, as they are revealed by the Spirit in the explanations of them that are given in the prophecies themselves, and the doctrine held by post-millennialists of a mere spiritual millennium, spiritual reign, spiritual resurrection, spiritual restoration of the Israelites, spiritual rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, spiritual priests, sacrifices, and kings, spiritual destruction of the anti-christian powers, spiritual binding of Satan, spiritual repeal of the curse of suffering, sorrow, and death, will vanish from existence. It has no other ground for its support. It is directly against the plain philological teachings of the Scriptures on the subject, as is admitted by Dr. S. himself; for he grants that "there are passages which, if literally interpreted, would go the whole length of the statement" he gives "of the premillennial advent;" and it is by treating those passages as allegorical, not, as he intimates, by interpreting them as figurative—that is, as containing comparisons, metaphors, metonymies, and other rhetorical figures, that that sense is excluded, and the other substituted in its place. The metaphors, comparisons, hypocatastases, metonymies, and other figures that occur in those predictions, so far from excluding the doctrine of premillennialism, are the means of embodying it, and give it a clearer and more emphatic expression. Let him produce an example from them, if he can, that does not confirm this statement. He will find the attempt altogether vain. The anti-millenarian system is thus the sheer invention of its advocates, and foisted in the place of the genuine teachings of the sacred word. It was contrived in order to make the Scriptures the vehicle of inculcating and giving authority to their theories; and while such is its character, the great principle on which it is founded is generally acknowledged by those who still act on it, to be wholly false and lawless. There is not an individual probably among the evangelical who found their constructions of the prophecies on it, who does not professedly reject the

allegorical method of interpretation introduced by Origen, and denounce it as subversive of the truths of revelation. It would be fatal to the reputation of a commentator formally to adopt and advocate it. It is the identical theory on which Swedenborg founds his exposition of the Scriptures. We lately received from England a voluminous work by a disciple of his, one principal object of which is to show that the great principle on which the spiritualists both of the ancient and modern Catholic and Protestant churches proceed in their interpretation of the Apocalypse, is that of Swedenborg, although their application of passages differs from his; and he demonstrates it by a vast array of quotations from writers of authority in both communions. It is the theory, too, essentially on which many of the German rationalists of the present day set aside the historical narratives and the doctrines of the Scriptures, under the pretence that they are myths. The creation and fall, the deluge, the confusion of tongues, the sacrifice of Isaac, the exodus from Egypt, the institution of the law at Sinai, the annunciation to the virgin of Christ's conception, the extraordinary circumstances of his birth, his miracles, his transfiguration, the portents that attended his death, his resurrection and ascension, are thus set aside as mere myths, allegories, or poetic fictions. And if it be legitimate, there is not a fact or truth inscribed on the sacred page that may not be as effectually expunged by it as the doctrine is of Christ's coming anterior to the millennium.

Such are the principles of interpretation that are maintained by millenarians, in contradistinction on the one hand from the false representations Dr. Spring has given of their views; and on the other, from the spiritualizing theory on which he and his party proceed. Such is the issue of his first objection, brought forward with such a parade of solemn professions of concern for the truth, of apprehension for the welfare of the church, of surprise and astonishment at the rashness and infatuation of those whom he opposes! Can a more unfortunate condition be imagined than that in which he has placed himself? Can a more ample demonstration be desired of the great injustice of his accusations? If he wrote precisely as he believed, what are we to think of his knowledge of the subject? If his knowledge is to be

taken as the measure of his powers, what are we to think of his ability to discern realities that stand before him in the clearest forms and largest dimensions, and flash on his eyes the glare of noonday? If he has fallen into these errors from inadvertence, what are we to think of his adventuring to treat in so confident a manner of a subject with which he has neglected to make himself acquainted, and misrepresenting and reproaching those whom he should have studied and approved?

His second allegation against the doctrine is, "that it obscures the spirituality of Christ's kingdom."—P. 119.

To this charge we answer, in the first place, that it is merely rationalistic, or founded on his notions of what constitutes the spirituality of the Redeemer's kingdom, not on the direct testimony of the Scriptures respecting the scene and the nature of his reign. But the question whether his second advent is to precede or follow the millennium, and whether his reign is to be on earth or in heaven, is to be determined by what is directly revealed in regard to them, not by Dr. S.'s ideas of the nature of a spiritual kingdom. What the Scriptures teach on the subject, is the point to be decided; not how or where, according to Dr. Spring's preconceived opinions, Christ must reign. It does not follow that he is not to reign on earth, from the fact that Dr. S. deems it inconsistent with the spirituality of his kingdom.

Next: But his idea of the spirituality of that kingdom is as mistaken and preposterous as the principle is of his accusation. He proceeds on the assumption that it depends on Christ's *absence or invisibility*; that if he is present in it, and reigns visibly, it must render it impossible to his subjects to render him a spiritual worship. For if Christ's visible presence and reign are not incompatible with the spirituality of his kingdom, how does that spirituality show that he is not to reign in that manner in his kingdom on earth? But what notion was ever advanced more utterly unscriptural and derogatory to Christ? It is a direct detraction of his perfections. "Light and love" are "the distinctive features," Dr. S. represents, of "the spirituality" of his kingdom. If his visible presence then and reign are incompatible with light and love, it must be because the manifestation of himself reveals imperfections that render it impossible to his

subjects to love and adore him. If he appears in his glory as the God-man; if he displays his infinite rights and attributes on a vaster scale and in more dazzling forms than he now does, why should there not be a proportional measure of light, or in other words, a corresponding knowledge of him? Why should there not be as pure and fervent love, as sincere and lofty adoration of him? Can Dr. S. give a satisfactory reason? His objection thus implies that there is something in Christ's presence or character that, if he reveals himself to those whom he redeems, must prove a natural obstacle to their love and adoration of him as divine and holy, and sink their homage into a mere sensual or social affection; and this degrading conception of that great Being is one of what he calls the "acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel" by which he proposes to illustrate his character, history, and glory! There are no means by which he can escape from this dilemma; for if he admits that the personal presence and reign of Christ with his redeemed in heaven can be no obstruction to a perfect knowledge and pure love and adoration of him, but must naturally aid and exalt them in proportion to the majesty with which he manifests his perfections to them; then he must grant that his personal presence and reign on earth cannot obscure the spirituality of his kingdom. Was there ever a more unfortunate position for a controversialist, who is endeavoring to convict those whom he assails of detracting from the spirituality of Christ's kingdom? Could he give more decisive evidence that he has undertaken to discuss a subject of which he has neglected to gain a proper knowledge—of which he has only the most mistaken and preposterous notions?

But this dogma that Christ's personal presence is incompatible with his exercising a spiritual rule, or receiving a spiritual homage, is as inconsistent with the representations of the sacred word as it is with Christ's perfections. Do the Scriptures anywhere intimate that the visible manifestations of himself, which God vouchsafed to the ancient patriarchs, prophets, and people of Israel, had the effect to divest their awe, love, trust, and homage of spirituality, and convert them into mere external acts, or reduce them within the sphere of the senses? Was that the result of his revelation

of himself to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses? Was that the impression produced by his descent in glory on Mount Sinai in the presence of the Israelites, and institution of the law? Was such the effect of the visions of him beheld by David, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the other prophets? Was that the effect of his transfiguration witnessed by Peter, James, and John? Was it of his appearance to the disciples and believers after his resurrection? Was it of his revelation of himself to Paul on his way to Damascus, and when caught up to the third heavens? Was such an influence exerted by his manifestation of himself to John in the visions of Patmos? These questions do not need an answer. It is surprising that Dr. S. should not have extended his thoughts far enough to perceive the confutation of his objection, which is presented by the impressions which the Scriptures everywhere represent the visible manifestation of Jehovah as having produced on those to whom he revealed himself.

But his objection is as applicable to the visible reign of God and Christ in heaven, in the presence of angels and the spirits of just men made perfect, as it is to his personal presence and reign on earth. Thousands of thousands minister to him there, we are told, and ten times ten thousand stand before him. In the visions of the Apocalypse, the living creatures and elders are exhibited as ceaselessly celebrating his infinite sanctitude and glory; and the angelic hosts as hymning the rights, and majesty, and honor of the Lamb; and Dr. Spring himself holds that all the redeemed are forever to live and reign with him where he personally and visibly manifests himself. If, then, his personal presence and visible reign on earth must obscure the spirituality of his kingdom, why must they not equally in heaven? If his reigning visibly in his glorified humanity in heaven is not compatible with the perfect homage of his creatures, but aids and exalts it, why should it not equally subserve that end on earth? It is a pitiable condition truly, when a controversialist has no other means of fastening an injurious charge on those whom he attacks, and rendering them objects of prejudice, than to detract from the grandeur of the Redeemer, defame the spirituality of his kingdom, and degrade his adorers on earth and in heaven, to the rank of

mere sensuous worshippers! It is a distressing task to be called to repel an assailant, who exhibits at every step the most resistless indications that he has no clear comprehension either of the Scriptures, or of himself,—who advances objections that are as applicable to the Bible and to his own scheme as they are to their views whom he expects to confound by them.

But he proceeds in this, as in his former objection, on a total misconception and misrepresentation of the views millenarians entertain of the import of the prophecies of the millennium; for he intimates that they regard the symbols of the Apocalypse as foreshowing the rise and occurrence of precisely such agents and events as they are themselves. Thus he says:

“The glory of this Spiritual reign is expressed to us not unfrequently by figures, and emblems, and symbols, addressed to our senses, because we are creatures of sense. They are instructive and affecting representations, if we carry this great truth along with us in order to interpret them; but without this we make havoc of the word of God. This great truth is worth all the literalism and all the algebraic laws of symbolization in the world. No man supposes that the sea of glass—the streets of the new Jerusalem—the river of life—the trees on its banks—the terraces of the city [not mentioned by John] sparkling with precious stones—the gates of pearl—the harps of gold and the white linen of the saints, are anything more than *emblems* of the beauty, purity, and bliss of this heavenly and spiritual kingdom. Nor does any man suppose that when the same writer, in the same metaphorical language, speaks of an ‘angel coming down from heaven having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand,’ and of his ‘laying hold on the dragon, that old serpent, and binding him a thousand years, and casting him into the bottomless pit, and setting a seal upon him,’ that there was *literally* any such *angel*, or *key*, or *chain*, or *dragon*, or *seal*. The meaning is, that the time is coming when Satan’s power on the earth shall be divinely and effectively restrained. And when the same writer proceeds in the next sentence to say that he ‘saw thrones, and they sat upon them; and the *souls* of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, nor in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years;’ no one supposes that these were literal *thrones*, nor any *person* that sat upon them,

nor any *beast*, nor *image*, nor any mark upon the forehead or hands. It was all a vision; and was designed to teach such truths as enlightened and devout minds would receive. The writer is speaking of the thousand years when the power of Satan should not only be restricted, but the power of piety revived, and the kingdom of Christ greatly advanced. The whole passage cannot be understood *literally* without the most preposterous conclusions."—Pp. 122, 123.

This is a specimen of the vague and confused ideas, and blundering representations that reign in every part of his discussion. He here specifically denies that any such symbols as those which he enumerates, were even exhibited to the apostle; or which is the same thing, that the objects beheld by the apostle were really what he denominates them. But that is not only to contradict the prophet, but is to annihilate the prophecy. John says that he *saw* "an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand, and he laid hold on the dragon that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled." As then he *saw* them, they were presented to his senses, and thence had a real existence exterior to and independent of him, and were therefore what he denominates them. That they were exhibited to him in vision is no proof that they were not real and apprehended by his senses, in contradistinction from being merely conceptional. And, moreover, if they were not both what the apostle denominates them, and actually present to him, then they can neither be the medium of such a revelation as purports to be made through them, nor of any revelation whatever. To deny that they were truly what he denominates them is to deny that they are the media of such a revelation as the symbols he designates are suited to make. To deny that they were present to him is to deny that any revelation whatever was made through them; for if there were no symbols to convey a revelation, then certainly no revelation can have been conveyed through symbols.

But let us assume, that instead of this extraordinary misrepresentation, what Dr. S. meant to state, was, that no one can rationally suppose that the things *foreshown* in those

visions are identically those or of the same kinds *as the symbols* themselves that are used to foreshow them; and we ask who imagines that they are? Not millenarians. Dr. S. implies that that is their theory; as otherwise his argument has no relevancy. But no representation could be more groundless and unjust. They universally regard those symbols as representatives of agents and events of a different order from themselves. The new Jerusalem is expressly interpreted in the prophecy as symbolizing the same body,—the risen and glorified saints,—as the Lamb's wife. Rev. xxi. 9, 10. The dragon is regarded by them as the symbol of Satan and his angels; and the key, the chain, the pit, and the seal, as representatives of analogous instruments; and the binding and imprisonment as symbolizing the fact of the removal of Satan and his hosts from the presence of the nations, and prevention by confinement from tempting them. That Satan himself alone is to be intercepted from exerting his deceptive influence, and that a chain is to be the instrument with which he is to be bound, and a pit shut with a key and seal, the place of his imprisonment, no millenarian, so far as we are aware, holds. So far from it, the theory which he here falsely ascribes to them is identically that on which his own party generally frame their constructions. The principle we have repeatedly had occasion to show, on which they usually proceed is, that the symbol and that which it foreshows, are precisely the same in kind. Thus, with scarce an exception, they maintain that the agents and events denoted by the symbols of the first four seals are warriors, wars, pestilence, famine, and death, because the symbols are horsemen who conquer, exact, and destroy with the sword famine, pestilence, and beasts. This notion, our readers need not be told, we have pointed out as a fatal error in their system, and have made it our chief aim to show, from the interpretations given in the prophecies themselves, that the great law of symbolization is directly the reverse; in all cases where the subject admits it, representatives being employed of a different species or class from the things that are foreshown by them. Yet in the face of this fact, which distinguishes the views of symbolization we have advanced, more than any other from the theories generally entertained, Dr. Spring represents that premillennialists, and we among

the rest, regard the things *foreshown* as identically the same in kind as the symbols by which they are represented. What a thorough mastery of the subject! what a lofty impartiality he displays! To make an effective onset on those whom he attacks, he falsely ascribes to them a leading doctrine held by his own party which they reject, and falsely claims as his own a doctrine never advanced by a solitary individual of his party, but that is peculiar to those whom he accuses of rejecting it. What a splendid device for achieving a victory!

He next attempts to confirm this charge of unspirituality by representing that the doctrine of Christ's personal reign has its origin in the appetites and passions of its advocates, and implies that the millennium is to be a period of sensualism and corruption.

"We may not utter all our objections in their full force to this sentimental, tender, and pathetic theory. We are instructed by the great Teacher, that except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God! Some of the features of modern millenarians are not difficult to be *seen*, nor are they altogether revolting to the natural heart. We are told that 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh;' nor may we forget the truth that in the resurrection, 'they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God.' It is the anti-spiritual view of Christ's kingdom which imparts attractiveness to it, which God himself has not given. We do not wonder that a theory which thus addresses itself to creatures of sense should produce excitement in the world. We do not wonder at the preposterous views concerning it in the first three centuries, nor that it sank in silence under the burden of its own unworthiness. We do not wonder at the wickedness of the Anabaptists of Munster, nor at the legal enactments against them; nor at the tragical issue of the 'celestial republic' of John of Leyden; nor are we surprised at the extravagance of the men of the 'Fifth Monarchy' during the time of Cromwell, establishing a heavenly kingdom on earth, which was the resort of deism, infidelity, and crime; nor do later errors of the same general family in our land surprise us. We respectfully submit to good men who, though they disclaim all participation in principles thus ruinous, yet advocate this anti-spiritual and literal theory: whether the fundamental principle of their system does not lead to such results, and whether the system they now oppose and which the Bible advocates is not a safer system."—Pp. 127-129.

He thus distinctly represents that the doctrine owes its "attractiveness" to its adaptation to gratify the sensual tastes and passions of unsanctified men, and that it naturally generates such revolting excesses as were perpetrated by the fanatics of Munster and Leyden; and calls upon good men to decide whether such are not its legitimate results, and whether therefore the system he advocates, is not a safer system. The part of the doctrine against which he alleges this charge, is the representation that the race are to continue to live in the natural body, and multiply during the thousand years of Christ's personal reign on the earth. It is a sufficient answer to it, therefore, in the first place, that if it have any just ground whatever, it is far more applicable to his own theory of the millennium than to that entertained by millenarians. For he holds in the most specific manner, that men are to continue to live on the earth in the natural body, and multiply during the thousand years; and goes so far as to intimate that none then of either sex will remain single, but that all will assume the marriage relation and have families. Thus, he says,

"The *social relations* form no small part of that wise and benevolent arrangement of Divine Providence, by which the institutions of religion and true religion itself are perpetuated from parents to their children, and the honor of the Redeemer becomes refulgent in the earth. They are dishonored now; but they will not be dishonored in that coming day, when '*a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation.*' *Few, if any, will then be found, who from a dissocial spirit, from avarice or licentiousness, from the dread of toil or the fears of responsibility, from indifference to the wise arrangements of the Author of their living, or from any other selfish considerations, countervail that great law by which these relations are rendered perpetual and pure. The world will be exclusively a world of families; or if here and there a solitary straggler is found beyond the bright zone that thus belts the earth, he will be pitied and wondered at as a wandering star.*"—Vol. ii. pp. 158, 159.

He thus maintains that marriage will then be universal, or nearly so; that if there are any exceptions they will spring from an extremely selfish or morose spirit, will be in palpable violation of the great and wise law of the Almighty, and will be regarded as indicating a hopeless reprobation. He

even asserts that the marriage relations are to be "perpetual." He holds accordingly that there will then be an immense multiplication of the race.

"Could we stand in the midst of those coming days, and view the population of this globe, we should see what has never yet been seen. Not a continent nor island, not a mountain nor valley, not river's bank nor iron-bound shore, not a sandy desert nor a bold promontory, but will *teem with the habitations of men. Successive generations* no longer traversing the earth in solitary streams or broad rivers, *shall flow on in one vast swelling ocean, everywhere multiplied as the sands on the shore.*"—Vol. ii. p. 160.

He asserts therefore in the fullest manner this great feature of the millennial period, and holds that it is to subserve in an eminent degree the purity and blessedness of the race, and the glory of the Redeemer. The only point in which his view on the subject differs from that entertained by millenarians, respects the personal presence of Christ. They maintain that he is then to be present in person on the earth. Dr. S. denies it, and holds that he is to continue in heaven. His representation, therefore, that the pre-millennial doctrine indicates that the millennium is to be a period of unbounded lawlessness and sensuality, directly imports, that it will owe that character to the personal presence and visible reign of the Redeemer; and implies accordingly that his presence will naturally release mankind from the restraints of law and decency, and prompt them to unbridled licentiousness; for why else should such corruption prevail, any more than though he were not present? Why else should an administration that is in itself pure, wise, and benevolent to the race, and glorious to the Redeemer, be utterly divested by his personal presence of those characteristics, and be rendered immeasurably debasing to them, and dishonorable to him?

Such is the implication of his charge. We leave our readers to judge of his candor and consistency in endeavoring not merely to crush the doctrine, but to destroy the character of those whom he opposes, by bringing forward an objection with such solemn parade as fatal to them, that lies equally against his own system. We leave them to estimate his wisdom in persuading himself that he illustrates the character and glory of Christ, by indulging in such a revolt-

ing detraction of his person and perfections. If it is consistent with the sanctitude and wisdom of the Most High to create beings of such an order, to make provision in their nature and in the laws under which he places them, for their multiplication; if he not only permits, but absolutely approves, sanctions, and enjoins it; if it is a wise and beneficent constitution, favorable in the utmost degree to the purity, piety, and dignity of the race; and if it is compatible with his perfections to reign over a world of beings of such a nature and living under such a law;—then it is solecistical to suppose that it is not as compatible with their purity, wisdom, and dignity, to live under his reign in person here, as under his reign in heaven: it is absurd to imagine that it is not as compatible with their spirituality and with his glory that he should reveal himself to them here, as though he concealed himself from their sight.

To his intimation, in the next place, that the pre-millennial doctrine gave rise to the excesses of the Anabaptists of Germany, we reply, that those fanatics were not pre-millennialists; but instead, their views coincided in several important respects, with those entertained by anti-millenarians. They did not look for the advent of Christ in order to the institution of the kingdom which they taught was soon to commence: but held that they were to establish it themselves, and were themselves to reign in it as kings and priests in the natural body, instead of Christ and the risen and glorified saints,—which are identically the views maintained by Dr. Spring and other anti-millenarians; and it was in connexion with that doctrine, not with the doctrine of Christ's personal advent and reign, that they plunged into their shameful excesses, and perpetrated their atrocious crimes.

Such is the character of his second objection; false, absurd, and self-confuting in every particular; levelled as much against himself, as those whom he opposes; and involving an infinite detraction of Christ's perfections, which it professes to glorify.

His next allegation is of the same character.

“A third objection to this theory is, that it gives undue and unwarranted influence to the mere personal presence of Christ in the conversion of the world. It does not assign its proper place to the

agencies in this work which already exist, and which God himself has appointed. When the Son of God ascended up on high, he bequeathed to his church all the agencies that are required for the extension and final triumph of his spiritual kingdom on earth. *These are the truths of his gospel and the omnipotent power of the Holy Spirit.* Just in the measure in which these are enjoyed will men turn from the error of their ways to the wisdom of the just.

* * * * *

"This is one of the grounds on which we stand in our opposition to the supposed premillennial advent. We might have said more than that this theory *does not assign* its proper place to the truth and the Spirit of God; but we should do violence to our own feelings to say more of those whom we have long known as the advocates of evangelical truth. Yet, when a recent and able writer* made this objection to the views on which we were animadverting, the leading organ in the expression of those views in this country† repelled the imputation with indignant sensitiveness. Let us see how this matter stands, and whether, according to their own showing, this indignant disclaimer will avail them. We affirm that they deny the sufficiency of *God's revealed truth* in the conversion of men; because they declare that at the period when the Jewish and Gentile nations are to be, as they suppose, assembled at Jerusalem, God 'is to give them new *revelations* and institute new laws;' that 'he is to make new communications of his will;' and that '*these revelations of himself* will be more efficient means than any others.' Is not this a plain denial of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and does it not unite all manner of pretensions to a new revelation?"

—Vol. ii. pp. 129-131.

His allegation—which he repeats and endeavors through a series of pages to confirm—thus is, that millenarians, and we especially, specifically deny that the truths revealed in the word of God are adequate to enable the Holy Spirit to convert the world; and assert or imply that the great object of Christ's personal coming or reign is to be to supply that inadequacy; that his presence is to supersede, in a measure at least, the use of the truths of the gospel and the agency of the Spirit in the conversion of men; or that their conversion is to be produced by his mere presence, irrespective of

* "Princeton Repertory, for April, 1851."

† "Theological and Literary Journal."

the truths of the gospel which it may exemplify and display. The whole pertinence of his objection depends on this representation ;—for if we and other millenarians do not hold nor intimate that the word of God is not adequate as a means to the conversion of the nations, if the Almighty Spirit chooses to render it efficacious by his influences ; if we do not hold nor imply that the object of Christ's coming is, either to supersede the instrumentality of truth, or to remedy a defect of his word ; if, on the contrary, we affirm in the most explicit terms that the Spirit is then, as now, to be the sole author, and the truths of the gospel the sole instrument of renovation ; and if we hold and show that *the very effect of Christ's presence* is to be to bring home the great truths of his being, and government, and of their character and condition, *which are taught in the gospel* more vividly and resistlessly to the realizations of men ; then Dr. S.'s imputations and objections fall to the ground ; and such is the fact, too plainly to admit of question.

In confutation, then, of his charge, we remark, in the first place, that it is not a favorable indication of the merits of his cause, that he refuses to enter directly into the inquiry whether the Scriptures teach that Christ is to come anterior to the millennium, and undertakes to prove that he cannot, on the ground that it would be to dishonor and supersede his word and the Spirit. What truth is safe if this rationalistic method is allowable ? Are Dr. S., and others whom he follows in this part of his argument, more competent than God himself to decide what administration is required by his perfections ? It is not a favorable mark of his cause that, in order to fasten a charge of error on those whom he assails, he finds it necessary—under the air of vindicating the adequacy of the word and Spirit—to depreciate the influence of Christ's personal presence, and represent that his advent and assumption of the sway of the world, manifestation of his infinite glory, exercise of his rights, display of his attributes, and verification of the great predictions of his word, must have the effect to eclipse the truths of his gospel, empty them of their significance, and consign them to dishonor and oblivion. It is a dark sign, indeed, when a cause cannot be sustained, except by detracting thus from the glory of the Redeemer, and implying that the great truths which

his personal presence and rule will reveal, must confute and confound the representations of his word! Yet Dr. S.'s whole argument here rests on this awful implication; for if the great facts and truths which are to be set forth by Christ's personal presence and reign, are *identically those that are taught in his word*, only manifested in a more dazzling effulgence, and impressed with a more resistless power, then plainly his presence is not to supersede them, divest them of their office, or rob them of their influence.

Next: He proceeds in his objection, on the assumption that if any new revelations are made at the period of Christ's coming, the reason must be that the truths already revealed are not sufficient to render it possible to the Holy Spirit to convert the world. "We affirm," he says, "that they deny the sufficiency of God's revealed truth in the conversion of men; *because* they declare that at the period when the Jewish and Gentile nations are to be, as they suppose, assembled at Jerusalem, God 'is to give them new revelations and institute new laws.'" But how does that follow? Does the fact that the Apocalypse was revealed upwards of sixty years after Christ's ascension, and thirty after the death of Paul, Peter, and most of the other apostles, imply that the truths that were previously made known, and embodied in the gospels, acts, and epistles of the New Testament, were insufficient "in the conversion of men?" Was not the Holy Spirit as perfectly able to convert the whole Hebrew nation by the truths that were proclaimed on the day of Pentecost, as he was to convince and renew the three thousand that were then turned to repentance and faith? Were not the truths which Paul communicated to the churches of Asia, as adequate to the conversion of men, as those which John made known to them? Dr. S. will not deny it. There are other ends for which revelations are made besides the mere conversion of the nations. Truth is the instrument of sanctification, as well as of conversion. It is the means of wisdom, as well as of a simple knowledge of the great facts of the work of redemption. It is essential to fit the redeemed for the high duties, and raise them to the high enjoyments to which they are to be called, as well as to be the means of their renovation. It is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for in-

struction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." What right has Dr. S. to assume that God must stop in the revelations he makes of himself and his will, at the point at which truth enough is communicated to make it barely possible to the Holy Spirit to convert the nations? Can Dr. S. seriously persuade himself that he has actually paused at that point? That would imply that the Spirit actually employs the whole sum of truth that is revealed in the sacred word, in every instance of conversion; and that would imply that a perfect comprehension of every truth that is embodied in the Scriptures is actually unveiled in the process of conversion to every individual who is renewed; and thence that every renovated person has a perfect comprehension of all that is taught in the sacred volume, prophetic, as well as didactic and historical! What a charming result of his assumption. If all the sanctified have been let into such a complete understanding of the word of God, how is it that they differ so sadly in respect to the things that are revealed? If all the truths made known in Isaiah, Daniel, and John, were actually unveiled to Dr. S.'s apprehension, and used as instruments in his conversion, how happens it that he does not decide the question directly from those prophets whether Christ is to come or not before the thousand years? Why does he prefer to rely on preconceived opinions and *a priori* reasoning? But no one will maintain that the Spirit of God employs all the truths that are embodied in the sacred word in the conversion of every or any individual. The presence, indeed, of such a sum of truth at the moment of regeneration, is impossible from the limited grasp of the mind. It would require a greater miracle than has ever been wrought in the conversion of men, to raise a finite intellect to a comprehension at once of such a boundless number of propositions. It is apparent, therefore, that God has not limited the revelations he has made to the truths that are essential to the renovation of the mind. He has imparted a vastly greater variety, and unveiled many of them in far higher degrees. He has communicated a multitude whose principal office is to influence the mind *after* its renovation is accomplished;—truths that concern the peculiar relations and duties that are consequent on conver-

sion, and respect the church and the everlasting kingdom, which is then made the object of faith and hope. The gift of new revelations then at Christ's advent will not imply that those which are already enjoyed by the church, are not sufficient for the conversion of men, any more than the additions that were made to these revelations by the inspiration of the apostles and the visions of the Apocalypse, imply that they were granted because the truths before revealed were not adequate to that office. They may be designed in a large degree for those who are already renewed, and be adapted to their new and peculiar condition, as many of those of which we now have a knowledge are designed chiefly for those who have already entered on the Christian life.

As to the question whether new revelations are in fact to be made at the period of the millennium, it is decided by the passage to which Dr. S. refers: Isaiah ii. 2-4, "And it shall come to pass in the last days"—regarded by Dr. S. himself as denoting the millennial age—"that the mountain of the Lord's house"—that is the mount on which the temple stood—"shall be established on the height of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, *and all nations shall flow unto it.* And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Here is thus a specific announcement, 1st, that in the millennial age, Jehovah is to have a temple on Mount Moriah; 2d, that all nations are then to repair to it; 3d, that one object of their resorting there is to be to learn his ways, and get instruction respecting his paths, or learn the great things that respect his kingdom and will; 4th, that the reason of their resorting there for that information is to be, that he is there to communicate his will and make known his law; 5th, and finally, that the effect of the communications he will there make will be to lead the nations—not to despise his word, or

slight his Spirit—but to lay aside their wars and contentions, convert their instruments of destruction into the implements of husbandry, and live together in righteousness and peace. Yet it is for receiving this and other similar passages in their plain grammatical sense, which is perfectly accordant with the great characters of God's present government, and the purposes he has revealed in respect to the future, and cannot be set aside except by a violation of the laws of language so arbitrary and monstrous, that if applied to other parts of the sacred volume, it would strike from our hands every fact and truth they contain:—it is for receiving this great and precious announcement that millenarians and ourselves especially are charged by Dr. S. and others with depreciating the revelation we now enjoy, denying its adequacy to the conversion of men, even when enforced by the power of the Holy Spirit, and implying that the office of renewing the mind is, at Christ's coming, to be withdrawn from the Spirit, and assumed and exercised by himself, and independently of the instrumentality of truth!—and all this in the name of zeal for the prerogatives and honor of the word and Spirit! Was there ever a more pitiable exhibition of misconception and self-contradiction? If these gentlemen are animated by such a desire to vindicate and honor the word of God, would it not be well for them to exemplify their reverence by receiving the announcements which it thus makes in the most plain and unequivocal manner, and allowing them their proper influence, in place of setting them aside under the pretence that they are allegorical, and signify something, no one can tell what, wholly different from their philological meaning? To mask such a bold rejection of what God reveals, and substitution of a theory of their own in its place, under the plea of zeal for his word, is not what we should expect from sincere and conscientious men, who understand what they are about. Let Dr. S. direct his zeal to the interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures according to their proper laws, and he will have no further occasion or disposition, we apprehend, to accuse millenarians of denying or dishonoring the sacred word.

And finally, that Dr. S. has urged these objections without a proper consideration of their bearing, is seen from the fact, that he himself maintains as emphatically as those whom he

assails, that there is to be a manifestation of Christ's perfections during the millennium, that will be far more august and impressive than that which is now made.

"It will be a day when *the glory of Christ shall be wonderfully manifested to the children of men.* Here lies the true glory of that coming day. *God himself is the true glory of all his works.* He is known now by 'the judgments which he executeth.' . . . *There are other glories of his NATURE to be unfolded ; other impressions of his excellence to be produced on the minds of men ;* other honors which he is to receive ere the last ingathering of men. *Some of these manifestations have already been made, and if it is a view unutterably grand and beautiful thus to 'stand and see the salvation of God,'* what will it be when that salvation is consummated, and its splendid glories burst upon the earth, and the tongue of the dumb is unloosed, and millions in every land exclaim, Behold, what hath God wrought? They are these strong and vivid impressions of the Deity made upon the *minds* of men which is *one great object* he has in view in the arrangements of his providence and the dispensations of his grace."—Vol. ii. pp. 171–172.

If, then, such extraordinary manifestations are truly to be made at that epoch of Christ's glory, and impressions produced so much more vivid and powerful on the minds of men of the Deity, why are they not as open to objection on Dr. S.'s principles as they would be if they were made through the personal presence and reign of Christ? And if new measures of knowledge are to be communicated by them, why does it not imply an inadequacy of that which is now enjoyed in the written word, as much as though it were imparted by a new revelation? He thus, in the description he gives of the millennium, completely deserts the ground on which he argues against millenarians and advances views that are as obnoxious as theirs are, to the objections he alleges against them. How much to be regretted it is that he missed the perception of this fact, which is as conspicuous as noonday to all other eyes.

He alleges as a fourth objection to the theory, "that it denies the general judgment and the final destruction of this material world." By the denial of a general judgment, he admits he does not mean a denial that all mankind, living and dead, are to be judged, but only that they are all to be

judged at the same epoch. Yet he treats the doctrine held by millenarians that the judgment of the living nations and the holy dead, is to take place at the beginning of the millennium, and of the unholy dead after the close of that period, as a fatal error involving the introduction of another gospel.

"There are so many important ends in the divine government to be secured by this arrangement, that to deny it is a virtual attempt to disturb the pillars by which it is supported, mar its symmetry, and deface its beauty. No judgment of individual men as such, or individual nations, can answer the end of a general judgment. That man does not preach the same gospel which Christ and his apostles preached who denies or obscures this great truth."—Vol. ii. p. 138.

This is undoubtedly sufficiently dogmatical, and if Dr. S. is to decide the question by his mere voice, instead of the word of God, no room is left for debate. As we treated of this subject at some length in the review of Mr. Brown's work, we shall now content ourselves with a very brief reply. 1. Dr. S. neither does nor can produce any passage from the Bible which expressly teaches or implies that all mankind, living and dead, are to be judged at the same epoch and after the millennium. 2. He admits that the judgment symbolized, Rev. xx. 11–15, when the sea, death, and the grave gave up the dead that were in them, denotes a judgment that is to take place after the thousand years have passed. But there is just as clear and specific a symbolization in the same chapter, v. 4–6, of a resurrection of the holy dead and their elevation to thrones, which implies their judgment and acceptance, at the commencement of the thousand years, and in order to their reigning with Christ during that period. Every consideration that shows that the other denotes a resurrection and judgment of the unholy dead after the millennium, shows with equal certainty and strength that this represents a resurrection and acceptance of the holy dead at the commencement of that period. There is no device that can set aside the one, or convert it into a representation of a mere moral change, that will not, with equal truth and propriety, work a similar metamorphosis of the other. 3. There is, besides, as formal and specific

a symbolization of a judgment of the living persons denoted by the ten-horned wild beast, or the apostate and persecuting civil and ecclesiastical powers of the western Roman empire anterior to the commencement of the millennium, Daniel vii. 9-12, as there is, Rev. xx. 11-15, of a judgment and destruction of the unholy dead after that period. It is as bold a contravention of the word of God to deny the one as it were to deny the other. Let the reader compare the two passages, and he will see that there are no others in the whole sacred volume, relating to different epochs, that present so exact a parallel to each other. 4. There is an equally specific revelation, Matt. xxv., that a judgment of all the living nations is to take place at the coming of Christ. Dr. S. indeed sneers at the statement made by us that the terms *πᾶσα ἔθνη*, all nations, denote the living population of the globe at the period to which the passages in which they are used refer. Nothing but a total inacquaintance with the usage of the terms could excuse such a blunder. Let him look into any respectable lexicographer—Wahl, Bretschneider, Robinson—and see if that is not the sense they ascribe to *ἔθνη*. Let him point out, if he can, a passage in the New Testament, in which it is not employed with that signification. This, however, is only one of the instances in which he substitutes the vague and mistaken notions he has had the misfortune to adopt, in place of the clear testimony of the word of God. And there is in Daniel vii. 13-28, Rev. xix. 11-21, Matt. xxiv., and Luke xxi., a clear and specific revelation that Christ is to come in person in the clouds, and commence his reign on earth at the time of the destruction of the antichristian powers, which is to precede the commencement of the millennium; so that the judgment of the living nations predicted Matt. xxv., which is to take place at his coming, is also to precede, instead of following the millennium. And with these, many other predictions coincide. The position of the two parties, then, is precisely this:—The millenarians have a large number of passages that expressly show that the judgment of the three great divisions of mankind, the holy dead, the living, and the unholy dead, is to take place at different epochs. Dr. S. rejects these specific teachings of the Scriptures, and maintains, without a passage that directly supports it, that the judgment of the

whole race is to take place at the same time, and after the end of the millennial period; and on this extraordinary ground he charges them with subverting "the divine government," and introducing a different "gospel" from that which "Christ and the apostles preached."

As it regards "the astonishing coolness with which they confront the Bible and endeavor to show that this world will not at last be burned up and destroyed," it is sufficient to reply, first, that the anti-millenarians themselves do not universally hold that the earth is to be annihilated; not a few of them reject the notion, as wholly without authority, and justly; as there is nothing in the passage, 2 Pet. iii. 10, which requires or justifies such a construction. It teaches that the heavens, by which is meant the atmosphere, is to rush or pass away, the elements melt with heat, and the earth and its works be burned—not burned *up*—that is, reduced to the simplest forms its matter is capable of assuming, and annihilated. That that is not the meaning, is shown by the assurance that immediately follows, that the apostle "nevertheless looked for a new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;" which denotes not another earth newly created, but the same identical earth renovated and freed from the curse brought on it by the fall; just as a new heart, a new creation, and a new life denote a renewed heart and life merely of the same identical individual, not the heart and life of a wholly different person.

His "fifth objection to this theory is, that it is inconsistent with the scriptural narrative of those events which are to take place between the millennium and the end of the world." But this, like all the others, is founded on his mere opinion, and is in the most palpable contradiction to fact. Thus his first specification in support of it is, that millenarians deny that the thousand years of Christ's reign on the earth are to have an end. Quoting Rev. xx. 7-11, he says:—

"There are several things in this narrative that are absolutely fatal to the hypothesis of the premillennial advent. In the first place, it speaks of events that are to take place on *this earth*, and affirms the thousand years of the Saviour's reign upon it are to have

an end. . . . This the millenarians deny, as we have before seen."—Pp. 143, 144.

But millenarians utter no such denial. They have no inducement to utter it. They hold as distinctly and undoubtingly as any others that the thousand years' reign is to end. What they maintain is, that notwithstanding that period and the peculiar administration that is to distinguish it are to end, Christ is still to continue to reign on the earth, and his saints are still to reign with him; and they found that belief on the express announcement, Daniel vii. 13, 14, that the dominion that is to be given to him over "all people, nations, and languages" when he comes "with the clouds of heaven," is to be "an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed;" that the kingdom which "the saints of the Most High" are then to take, they are to "possess for ever, even for ever and ever," v. 18; and that that kingdom is to be "under the whole heaven," or, in other words, on this earth, and is to contain "all the dominions" that exist on the globe, v. 27. They found it also on the assurance addressed to Mary at the annunciation of the birth of Jesus, that "the Lord God shall give unto him *the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever*; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke i. 31–33. And finally they found it on the announcement, Rev. xxi., xxii. 1–5, that the servants of God who are to eat of the tree of life in the New Jerusalem, which is to come down from heaven to *earth*, are to see his face there, live in his light, and reign for ever and ever. And such is the uniform representation of the Scriptures on the subject. Can more ample authority be required for the doctrine held by millenarians? Yet in the face of this array of testimonies, Dr. Spring has "the astonishing coolness to confront" them, and allege the fact that the thousand years' reign is to end, as "absolutely fatal" to the doctrine of the perpetuity of Christ's kingdom on earth. He is not able to discern the consistency, it seems, of the expiration of a specific period of a reign, marked by a peculiar condition of his empire, and the perpetuity of his reign itself over that empire in a different condition. And yet he maintains that Christ's reign is to

continue for ever, though not in this world. But why is not the termination of the peculiar administration of the thousand years, as compatible with the continuance of his reign on earth in a different form, as it is with its continuance in another world? What a singular fatality marks Dr. S.'s objections! They are, first, wholly false; and next, were they true, they are as fatal to his system as to theirs against whom he alleges them.

He proceeds:—"In the next place, it"—Rev. xx. 7-11—"affirms that the judgment will not take place till the *close* of the thousand years; it was not until *the thousand years had expired* that the books were opened, and every man judged according to his works. This also millenarians deny." This is equally at variance with fact. Millenarians do not deny that the judgment which is symbolized, Rev. xx. 11-15, is to take place after the close of the thousand years. They maintain it in the most explicit manner. That which they hold in opposition to the doctrine taught by their opponents is, first, that besides *that* judgment of the unholy dead, there is to be at the commencement of the thousand years a resurrection and judgment of the holy dead—a resurrection as clearly revealed and a judgment as clearly implied as that is which is to follow the thousand years: and next, that a judgment of the living, also fore-shown, Matt. xxv., is to take place at the advent of Christ, at the same epoch. These judgments Dr. S. and his party deny. It is he, therefore, and those who agree with him, who deny that the judgments God has revealed are to take place, not millenarians, whom he accuses of that error. He adds:—

"And in the third place, it speaks of a great and final conflict between the powers of light and the powers of darkness, which is to take place between the *close* of the millennial reign and the *subsequent* and second coming of the Son of Man. This the millenarians also deny, and affirm that the final battle is to take place long before, and when Christ comes in person to introduce the millennial reign, and to establish his kingdom. Will they explain these incoherences in their theory?"—P. 144.

We will endeavor to give him the information he needs,

and it lies in the fact that there is not a particle of truth in his accusation. It is a sheer fabrication, on which we should not suppose a writer, able to comprehend the simplest subject, could possibly venture. Millenarians do not deny that there is to be a deception and revolt of the nations, symbolized by Gog and Magog, on the unbinding of Satan after the close of the thousand years. They universally, so far as we are aware, recognise it. Let any one who wishes to assure himself of the fact consult their works. They may see what views we entertain of it in the Exposition of the Apocalypse, p. 523, and in the Journal, vol. iv. pp. 163-167. But what makes this accusation the more extraordinary is that if it have any validity, he is himself as obnoxious to it as those whom he accuses. He goes on to ask,

“Will they”—millenarians—“explain these incoherences in their theory? Will they inform us how it is upon their hypothesis that the spirit of antichrist is to rise again in the earth after the thousand years are expired? Will they inform us how it is that the great and final conflict which they assign to a period previous to the millennium, John speaks of as after the millennium?”—P. 144.

Now, as he himself, as well as millenarians, holds that this final apostasy is to take place after the termination of the thousand years, how is it that they are any more bound to explain the manner in which it is to arise than he is? And how is it, if no satisfactory explanation of it can be given, that it is not as fatal to his hypothesis as it can be to theirs? What exquisite proofs he exhibits of his comprehension of the subject! What admirable judgment he displays in selecting his points of attack, and indicating to his readers his consciousness of the hopeless overthrow of those whom he assails! But what difficulty is there in explaining the revolt of the nations at that period on their views any more than on his? They hold, as well as he, that men are to continue in the natural body, and multiply during the millennium; and he makes that branch of their doctrine a ground of some of his unjust and malignant imputations on them. Why, then, may not the generation that comes into life after the close of the thousand years, when Satan and his angels are again to be unloosed, be as readily seduced to

revolt as the nations of the present day are? What other solution can be required than that, on the one hand, they are to be tempted by Satan and his hosts; and on the other, are not to be restrained and renewed by the Spirit of God?

He is equally unfortunate in the statement, "that the great and final conflict which they assign to a period previous to the millennium, John speaks of as after the millennium." The great battle of God Almighty, which they hold is to precede the thousand years, is expressly exhibited by John and Daniel as to take place prior to Christ's millennial reign. Daniel, chap. vii. 9-12, in the most specific manner represents the judgment and destruction of the powers denoted by the ten-horned beast, as to precede the investiture of the Son of Man with the dominion of the earth, and institution of the kingdom of the saints; and John also exhibits the gathering together of the kings of the whole habitable world to that battle as to take place during the effusion of the sixth vial, which Dr. Spring indicates is now pouring, and assigns the destruction of the persecuting powers to the period of the seventh vial and seventh trumpet, chap. xi. 14-19, xvi. 14-21, xvii., xviii., xix. And finally, to complete the confutation of this charge, Dr. S. himself holds that that great battle, in which the persecuting powers, symbolized by the beast and false prophet, are to be destroyed, is to precede, not to follow the millennium. He says:—

"Without attempting to specify the events in the past or the future history of the world, which correspond with the pouring out of the seven vials containing the seven last plagues, it is enough for us here to say, that they are all emblematical of the judgments that are to descend upon the earth *in order to prepare the way for the reign of Jesus Christ among men.* And they are to be continued down to the period when John 'saw an angel come down from heaven having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand' to bind 'that old serpent which is the devil and Satan' a thousand years. The evidence preponderates in favor of the conclusion that *the sixth vial is now being poured upon the earth, and has been descending for many years that are past, and will yet descend for years to come.* The 'Holy City,' the true church of God, is still 'trodden under foot of the Gentiles,' infested by enemies and false friends, and in the old world especially, the witnesses for the truth are prophesying in sack-

cloth. 'For a series of years events have been taking place, which indicate the overthrow both of THE IMPERIAL AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL BEAST, or in other words, the beast and the false prophet, and by which the sources of all antichristian powers have been seen gradually drying up like the drying up of a mighty river, which, for many ages, has been overflowing all its banks. How long before the seventh and last vial will begin to be poured out, we are not warranted in determining, any farther than to say that *this last series of judgments* is yet to visit the earth. There is little doubt that the spirit of wickedness is yet to become rampant in all its forms of arbitrary power, vile hypocrisy, giddy worldliness, bold infidelity, and filthy crimes; nor is there any doubt that they will combine their counsels and their power against the Son of God and his struggling church, and that in *this last battle which is to precede the millennium*, the kingdom of darkness will be made to tremble. . . .

"Throughout all this period, God's designs are represented as rapidly coming to maturity for the introduction of this predicted day of his great power and glory. The assembly of the first born, we are told, will give glory to God both for these judgments and for the dawning of millennial glory as *simultaneous events*. Immediately as this ascription of glory to God is being given, the angel who interpreted the vision is heard saying, 'Write blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb.' Then it was that the song of triumph began, 'and I heard the voice of a great multitude—saying Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.' Then the devil will be chained and the millennium will advance by progressive and rapid steps."—Pp. 152–156.

By his own showing, then, millenarians give a just construction of the predictions of Daniel and John respecting the great battle of God Almighty, in exhibiting it as to take place at the commencement of the millennium, and Dr. Spring contradicts both the Apocalypse and himself in asserting that John speaks of it as after that period. Was there ever before such an exhibition made of "incoherence" and confusion of mind? Was ever such a fatal facility betrayed of at once, confronting the Bible, misrepresenting those whom he assails, and contradicting himself?

He next refers to the description of the new heaven and new earth, and of the new Jerusalem, which the prophet saw descending out of heaven from God, and avers:

"This whole narrative is equally fatal to the premillennial theory. It affirms that the first heaven and first earth are passed away ; which this theory denies. It affirms that the great and glorious scenes and events which it speaks of are realized, not till after the judgment. This also millenarians deny, and declare that they are realized during the thousand years of Christ's personal reign on the earth. Will they explain these inconsistencies between the inspired writer, and their own hypothesis?"—Pp. 144–145.

We reply, then, in the first place, that millenarians do not deny that the first heaven and first earth are to pass away at the period to which the prophecy refers,—the commencement of the millennium. They generally regard the first heaven and earth as that heaven and earth which had been used in the preceding part of the Apocalypse as symbols of the rulers and population of the globe ; as under the sixth seal, the first four trumpets, and the first four vials ; and the new heaven and new earth as the renovated heaven and earth which Isaiah beheld, and for which Peter looked : and regard these last as used as *symbols* of the rulers and population under the reign of Christ during the thousand years. See Exposition of the Apocalypse, p. 527 ; and Theological and Lit. Journal, vol. iii. pp. 342–347. This construction, however, which Dr. S. himself puts on the earth, sea, rivers, sun, and the atmosphere, on which as the symbols of the nations and their civil and ecclesiastical rulers, the vials were poured out, that foreshow, he admits, the judgments that are to be inflicted on the powers denoted by the beast and false prophet and their subjects, he rejects here, and regards the first heaven and earth,—if we understand him,—as representing themselves, instead of men ; their passing away, as denoting their annihilation ; and the new heaven and earth accordingly as heaven itself, or a new and remote world, in which he supposes the Redeemer is to reign after the annihilation of this. Such a passing away of the literal heavens and earth, millenarians do indeed deny, and on the best possible ground ; as the new Jerusalem came down from God out of heaven to *the earth*, not to a different orb, situated no one knows where. This is seen from the fact that it came where men reside ; for it is God's tabernacle with *men*, in which he is to dwell with them, and

be their God, and they are to be his people. It is seen from the fact that John was taken to a high mountain—a station on the earth—to behold it, not to a distant world; and finally, it is seen from the fact that the nations of the earth are to walk in the light of it, and be healed by the tree of life that is to grow on the banks of its river; and that “the kings of *the earth*” are to “bring their glory and honor into it.” It is seen also from Isaiah, in which the creation of new heavens and a new earth is shown to involve the creation of “Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy,” and that there are then to be infants and old men, and that they are to build houses and inhabit them, and plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them,” chap. lxv. 17–25. The earth, then, which is to be the scene of these great events, is indisputably to be the same earth as the present, except that it is to be freed from the curse brought on it by sin, and restored to fruitfulness and beauty. Instead of this construction, which is corroborated by a great number of passages, Dr. S. falls into the extraordinary error of regarding the new heaven and new earth, which John saw, as the heavenly world where Christ now reigns,—an interpretation wholly irreconcilable with the context, and at war with the usage of the sacred volume. It is he accordingly, not millenarians, who needs to “explain these inconsistencies between the inspired writer and his own hypothesis.”

He is, of course, at equal fault in representing the narrative, Rev. xxi., as affirming “that the great and glorious scenes and events which it speaks of are realized not till after the judgment” of the dead symbolized chap. xx. 11–15. It utters no such affirmation. Instead, that judgment is expressly represented as taking place after the close of the thousand years; while the advent of Christ, the resurrection of the saints, the conversion of the kingdoms of the earth into Christ’s kingdom, and the reign of the saints with him, are exhibited as taking place at the commencement of the millennium. Rev. xix. 11–16., xx. 4–6., xi. 15. And this Dr. Spring himself, with his usual self-contradiction, in effect, admits in the passage quoted from his 156th page; for he expressly exhibits “the marriage of the Lamb,” of whose wife the new Jerusalem, as interpreted by the angel, is the symbol, chap. xxi. 9, 10, as to take place at the com-

mencement of the thousand years. That marriage is to be consequent on her judgment and acceptance, manifestly from the consideration that she is in preparation for it, to be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, which is interpreted as the symbol of the righteousness of saints. But *the gift* of a white robe is the symbol of the gift of justification. She is then to be justified. There is therefore,—contrary to Dr. S.'s theory,—to be a judgment of saints at the commencement of the millennium, and they who are thus to be justified are the risen and glorified saints. This is shown by the fact that the saints who have died are to be judged and rewarded under the seventh trumpet, chap. xi. 15–18; that their resurrection is to be the epoch of their adoption, which must include their justification, Rom. viii. 23; that they are to be raised, invested with judicial authority, and seated on thrones to reign with Christ at the commencement of the thousand years, Rev. xx. 4–6; and that they are then to come with him *from heaven*; 1. Thess. iv. 15, Rev. xxi. 9, 10; not to consist of those who reside on the earth at his coming. Millenarians are amply justified, therefore, by the word of God, in maintaining that “the great and glorious scenes and events,” foreshown by the new heaven, new earth, and new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi., are to be realized during the period denoted by the thousand years; not subsequently, as Dr. S. avers, to the judgment of the dead, which is to take place after the termination of that period. The inconsistencies, therefore, that need to be explained, subsist between his own hypothesis,—not theirs,—and the inspired writer.

He finally concludes his long array of accusations by a “sixth objection to the theory, that it is fitted to produce mischievous and fanatical impressions upon the minds of men, in relation to the period of Christ's second coming,” p. 145. And this it should be recollected is one of what he denominates “those acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel” which he employs as the criteria by which the doctrine is to be judged. Putting his criteria and his objection together, therefore, they form the rare proposition—worthy of the genius of its author—that it is one of the acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel, that the doctrine maintained by millenarians, that Christ's second coming is to precede the millennium, is fitted to produce mis-

chievous and fanatical impressions upon the minds of men!" What a splendid method of winding up the controversy! What a flood of self-evidence suffuses his position! How just and candid, thus first to take the point at issue for granted, and then make the doctrine responsible for the evil effects that result from the misconception or perversion of it! Is there any fact or truth of the sacred Scriptures that may not be set aside by such a process? Christ himself says, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace but a sword; for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Do these evil results of his interposition show that the narratives of his life and his doctrines, which were to excite them, were false? We are told also by one of his apostles that the predictions themselves of his second advent are in the last days to excite the sneers of scoffers walking after their own lusts and saying where is the promise of his coming? Does this prove that that promise is false, and that those who receive it are fanatics and subverters of "the divine government?" If not, why does the fact that men sometimes misconceive and pervert the great doctrine of his coming anterior to the millennium, any more prove or imply that that doctrine is false, and justify the charge that it is fitted to produce mischievous and fanatical impressions on the minds of men? But Dr. S.'s objection is, in fact, levelled against the Son of God himself; for he expressly announces that immediately before they shall see him coming in a cloud with power and great glory, there is to be upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. Very much such effects as Dr. Spring presumptuously alleges as proofs of the falsehood of the doctrine, the Saviour thus foreshows are actually to result from it on a great scale. The blow, accordingly, with which he expected to dispatch millenarians is, in fact, aimed at him. It indicates a sad dearth of: ~~at~~ his object, when thus reduced to objections to a doctrine in the

conception or perversion of it. The mischievous and fanatical impressions to which he refers, so far as those terms express their true character, are produced, he well knows, by false views and misrepresentations, in some form, of the doctrine; and are no more chargeable on the doctrine itself than the alarm and trouble of the Thessalonians were, which were occasioned by the report spread by false or mistaken teachers, with a pretence of authority for it from Paul—that Christ had already come; or than the jeers and mockeries are of the scoffers, who are hereafter to deny that he is to come at all; but so morbid and splenetic are his feelings, and so great is his eagerness to fix the brand of fatal error and fanaticism on those whom he assails, that he seems willing to descend to any expedient by which he can accomplish it, however unjust it may be to them, or derogatory to the Saviour, whose glory he represents it as his aim to illustrate.

Such are the six objections—founded on the grossest and most unpardonable misrepresentation, at war on many points with the plainest testimonies of the sacred word, and contradictory at every step to his own assertions and admissions—which Dr. S. has the “astonishing coolness” to denominate “acknowledged principles and truths of the gospel,” and allege as proofs that the doctrine of the premillennial advent is an error, and its advocates, introducers of another gospel, and subverters of the “divine government.” Having confuted these, we shall now turn and show that he himself is obnoxious to the charge he thus unjustly alleges against them, of misrepresenting and subverting the prophecies which he affects to vindicate from their misconstructions.

And, in the first place, in denying, in the passage quoted from his 122d and 123d pages, that there are any symbols in the vision of the binding of Satan and the resurrection of the martyrs and other holy dead, Rev. xx. 1–6, he in effect denies that there is any fiction made in those or any of the Scriptures. He can no more deny that the apostle relates he beheld in vision those which he denominated the sealed book, the seven stars at the altar, the sun,

moon, and stars of the sixth seal, the fiery tempest, the burning mountain, the wormwood meteor, the locusts, the horsemen from the Euphrates, the dragon; or that Daniel saw those which he calls wild beasts, the Ancient of days, the thousands that stood before him, and the Son of Man. But if no such symbols were presented to those prophets, then plainly no revelation can have been made through them; and the representation that they are prophecies is groundless and deceptive. Such is the result to which the license he takes in order to overthrow millenarianism inevitably leads. Professor Stuart undertook to divest the symbols of the Apocalypse of their proper character and convert them into mere drapery, by representing them as fictions of the apostle; Dr. Spring dispatches them with equal effect by denying their existence.

In the next place, he cannot, on the principles on which he proceeds, verify any of the constructions he puts on the visions of the Apocalypse. Thus, as he maintains that the souls that were seen as symbols in the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 4-6, were disembodied souls (notwithstanding the apostle states that they *lived* in contradistinction from remaining corporeally dead as the rest of the dead continued during the thousand years), and holds also that they were representatives simply of souls; he must, to be consistent, regard the represented souls as disembodied also. They cannot, on his principle of interpretation, be the souls of persons living in the natural body. Instead, his explication implies that the souls that are to undergo the moral renovation he exhibits the vision as indicating, are the souls of persons who have died in impenitence; for what other class of disembodied minds can require such a renovation?

Again, in denying that a corporeal resurrection is symbolized in that vision, he in effect denies that in the corresponding vision of the resurrection of the unholy dead, Rev. xx. 11-15, there is any symbolization of a corporeal resurrection. The visions are parallel. The persons in each vision said to be raised are the dead. They are in each exhibited as raised to a corporeal life. The living of those in the first vision is expressly declared by the revealing Spirit to be the first resurrection, and to be a change in which those who are already holy are to share; not by which the impenitent and

lost are to be made holy and blessed. If, therefore, notwithstanding these plain delineations of a corporeal resurrection, the first denotes nothing more than a moral change of those to whom the vision relates, then Dr. Spring can have no ground for the assumption that the resurrection indicated by the second is anything more than a moral change.

In like manner, in denying that the vision, Rev. xix. 11-21, indicates the personal and visible descent of Christ from heaven, at the great battle, when the beast and false prophet are to be taken, and the kings and their armies slain, he puts it out of his power to prove that the vision of the last judgment, Rev. xx. 11-15, shows that he is to be personally and visibly present at that judgment. The one was no more beheld by the apostle than the other. Christ was no more personally and visibly present in the one than he was in the other. The acts that are ascribed to him in the one are no more peculiar to his office as judge and rewarder than are those of the other. If, therefore, the one indicates, as Dr. S. maintains, nothing but what he denominates a spiritual presence, which would be no spiritual presence at all, in that instance, as it would denote nothing more than his ordinary providence directing the agency of his creatures, then plainly the other can mean nothing more than such a providential direction of creatures; and Dr. S.'s assumption that it indicates the second advent of the Redeemer, falls to the ground. And so of the binding of Satan, the judgment of the nations, the destruction of the persecuting powers, and all his other constructions. There is not one that is not overturned by his own principles of interpretation.

In the third place, in admitting that the civil and ecclesiastical powers represented by the beast and false prophet are to be destroyed anterior to the millennium, he in effect admits that Christ's second advent is to take place before that period; for it is expressly foretold that the man of sin, who denotes the same ecclesiastical power as the false prophet, is to be destroyed by his coming, 2 Thess. ii. 8. It is foreshown also that it is to be accomplished at his personal coming as the sovereign of the world, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords, Dan. vii. 9-12, and Rev. xix. 11-21. And such is the representation also in many other

passages. Dr. S. therefore cannot deny that Christ's personal presence and agency in the vision, Rev. xix. 11-21, symbolize his real coming and agency in the destruction of the beast and false prophet, without denying that his presence and agency in the vision of the last resurrection and judgment, Rev. xx. 11-15, are any proofs that he is to be really present and act as the judge of the dead at the epoch to which that vision refers.

In like manner, in admitting that the millennium and reign of the saints is near, he virtually admits that the personal advent of the Redeemer is at hand; for it is expressly announced that it is at the period of the third woe, or last vial, which Dr. S. regards as near, that the kingdom of the world is to become our Lord's and his Messiah's, Rev. xi. 14, 15; and it is shown, Daniel vii. 13-18, that the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven and his investiture with the dominion of all people, nations, and languages, is to take place at the same epoch, as the taking and possessing of the kingdom by the saints of the Most High, and that both are immediately to follow the judgment and destruction of the civil and ecclesiastical powers symbolized by the ten-horned beast of that prophecy. Dr. S. is thus as much at variance with the Scriptures, and at war with himself, as he is with those whose views he labors so zealously to overturn.

Such are the great characteristics of his attack on millenarianism. There are many other passages that are obnoxious to similar animadversion; but those we have cited sufficiently show the mode in which he treats the question, and the spirit with which he is animated. What now are we to think of his accusations? Was there ever a more gratuitous and unprovoked assault? Were ever more unjustifiable means employed to convict a body of Christ's disciples of fatal errors? Were ever more decisive proofs exhibited of a total misconception of the subject? Were ever more sad indications seen of an inability to master a plain question? Were ever bolder denials offered of indisputable teachings of the word of God? Did ever a writer before venture on such detractions from the sanctitude and glory of the Redeemer, in order to brand those whom he accuses with the stigma of unspirituality and sensualism? Did ever a combatant before more effectually confound himself, and the predictions

he proposes to explain? Did ever a champion more unfortunately embarrass and discredit the party whose cause he attempted to maintain? If this and the somewhat similar assaults that have preceded it, are to be taken as specimens of the cause and its advocates, anti-millenarianism, instead of a victory, is in a fair way to be disgraced. Who that has either candor or sense, will, after a few more such exhibitions, be willing to belong to a party that has no better means of maintaining itself and confuting its opponents? The experiment has now been made for the fifth time, and has only resulted in showing that if the doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent is to be put down, it must be by writers of quite another class, and by weapons of a wholly different species. Something better than an extreme inacquaintance with the question, a resolute determination not to investigate it, a blind and bigoted prejudice,—something better than haughty dogmatism, gross misrepresentation, malevolent inuendoes, or bold misconstructions of the word of God, will be requisite. We appeal to all fair-minded and honorable anti-millenarians themselves whether it is not time that these shameful instruments should be laid aside,—whether the interests of religion, and the credit of their own cause, do not demand it. Why is it that the discussion is left to such writers as Beattie—far the most respectable of the number—Steele, Brown, Rankin, and Dr. Spring; not one of whom has touched the points on which the question really turns; not one of whom exhibits a tolerable knowledge of a single branch of the subject; not one of whom has had the skill to avoid the most palpable misrepresentations of millenarianism, and the most serious misconceptions of the word of God; and not one of whom, with the exception of Mr. Beattie, but has seemed to be prompted by a desire, at all hazards, to blacken and disgrace those whom he assails. There is among those who dissent from the doctrine, no dearth of men who possess ample talents, learning, and candor to discuss the question; and who are aware of the folly of attempting to determine it by mere skirmishing on the ground of arbitrary assumption, and with the weapons of prejudice and misrepresentation. If, then, it is to be further treated, let it be by men of that class, who can see, that if settled at all, it must be by ascertaining what the laws of

literal and figurative language and of symbols are, and a rigid application of them to the prophecies. If no competent anti-millenarian can be found to adopt that method of investigation, the subject had better be dropped by the party. But he who shall institute and pursue that inquiry with a proper spirit, instead of dealing with vague shadows, or the spectres of a disordered fancy, will soon find himself in the presence of realities—of great and indisputable truths—of laws that cannot be controverted, and that conduct to clear and indubitable results; and in place of indulging in spleetic complaints and malevolent denunciations, will be led joyfully to join in receiving and proclaiming the great and glorious certainty that the advent of Christ is to precede and introduce the millennium, and his personal presence to constitute its chief glory.

ART. V.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

I. NOTES EXPLANATORY AND PRACTICAL ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By ALBERT BARNES. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

MR. BARNES completes in this volume his commentary on the New Testament. He deserves much credit for the diligence and perseverance with which he has wrought at his great task. While discharging his duties as a pastor, he has produced more for the press than most even of the laborious, whose profession it is to interpret the Scriptures, and who have nothing to withhold them from devoting a large share of their time to the preparation of works for the public. Though, however, he has written so largely, and has enjoyed a very flattering patronage, his rank as an expositor is not high. He is rather a compiler than an original and thorough investigator. He has not the keen perception, the comprehensive views, the just taste, or thorough learning, that are requisite to a profound and authoritative commentator. He composes with too much haste, is superficial, is easily led astray by impulses, neglects revision, and is prolix and repetitious. Besides these faults, that result probably from a peculiar cast of mind and defective training, he runs into others gratuitously, that present him in a disadvantageous light as a scholar, and detract from the influence of his opi-

nions. Thus he refers perpetually to certain commentators or lexicographers in justification of his constructions of common Greek terms, that are not at all peculiar nor controverted by expositors, and cites authors on almost every page to verify facts and sanction opinions that no one questions or considers of essential importance. This is prompted, perhaps, by a wish to give his notes an air of critical research. On the considerate reader, however, it produces the opposite impression; as it naturally prompts the inquiry,—if Mr. Barnes feels himself so unable to decide on the meaning of common Greek words, that he deems it necessary to refer to others to sustain his constructions, how can he be entitled to reliance in his decisions on points of consequence that are not fortified by any extraneous authority, but are put forth as the work of his own unaided judgment? He can scarcely be supposed to refer to authorities in such instances, from a reluctance, without acknowledgment, to appropriate to himself information for which he is indebted to others; as in many of those cases there is no more propriety in his citing the individuals to whom he refers than there would be in quoting scores of others; and as he in fact, in the explanation of a great number of passages, appropriates to himself original and peculiar views from others, not only without acknowledgment, but in a manner that would lead one not acquainted with the sources from which he draws his constructions to regard them as the result of his own independent investigation. The effect is thus highly prejudicial to his reputation; the course he pursues being precisely such as a writer of an inferior rank, who wishes to pass for more than he is worth, might be likely to take, but which a genuine scholar would avoid and disdain. Instead of such a seeming sycophancy, where he neither owes any obligation nor can gain any benefit, it were far more manly to rely on himself exclusively in all cases where, if competent at all to the task he undertakes, he should be as competent as any of those whom he cites.

This blemish, however, is of but secondary importance. A far more essential question is, whether the principles on which he proceeds in his interpretations, and the constructions he places on the prophecy, are just. He represents, that on his entering on the undertaking he had neither any theory of the relation in which symbols are used, nor belief even that they are susceptible of a satisfactory explanation.

“Up to the time of commencing the exposition of this book, I had no theory in my own mind as to its meaning. I may add, that I had a prevailing belief that it could *not* be explained, and that all attempts to explain it must be visionary and futile . . .

"In this state of things the utmost I contemplated, when I began to write on it, was to explain as well as I could the meaning of the language and symbols, without attempting to apply the explanation to the events of past history, or to inquire what is to occur hereafter. I supposed that I might venture to do this without encountering the danger of adding another vain attempt to explain a book so full of mysteries, or of propounding a theory of interpretation, to be set aside, perhaps, by the next person that should prepare a commentary on the book.

"Beginning with this aim, I found myself soon insensibly inquiring whether, in the events which succeeded the time when the book was written, there were not historical facts of which the emblems employed would be natural and proper symbols, *on the supposition that it was the divine intention in disclosing these visions to refer to them*; and whether, therefore, there might not be a natural and proper application of the symbols to these events. In this way I examined the language used in reference to the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth seals, with no anticipation or plan in examining one as to what would be disclosed under the next seal; and in this way, also, I examined ultimately the whole book, proceeding step by step in ascertaining the meaning of each word and symbol as it occurred, but with no theoretic anticipation as to what was to follow. To my surprise I found, chiefly in Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, a series of events recorded, *such as seemed to me to correspond to a great extent with the series of symbols found in the Apocalypse*. The symbols were such as might be supposed *would be used*, on the supposition that they were intended to refer to these events, and the language of Mr. Gibbon was often such as *he would have used*, on the supposition that he had designed to prepare a commentary on the symbols employed by John. It was such in fact that, had it been found in a Christian writer, professedly writing a commentary on the book of Revelation, it would have been regarded by infidels as a designed attempt to force history to utter a language that should conform to a predetermined theory in expounding a book full of symbols. So remarkable have these considerations appeared to me in the course of this exposition, that it has almost seemed as if he had designed to write a commentary on some portion of this book, and I have found it difficult to doubt that that distinguished historian was raised up by an overruling Providence to make a record of those events which would ever afterwards be regarded as an impartial and unprejudiced statement of the evidences of the fulfilment of prophecy. The historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* had no belief in

the divine origin of Christianity, but he brought to the performance of his work learning and talent, such as few Christian scholars have possessed. He is always patient in his investigations, learned and scholar-like in his references, comprehensive in his groupings, and sufficiently minute in his details; unbiassed in his statements of facts, and usually cool and candid in his estimates of the causes of the events which he records."—Preface, pp. iv.–vi.

He gives no direct statement or intimation here what the ground is of the persuasion on which he proceeds, that the symbols of the Apocalypse are such as *would have been used* if it had been the divine intention in these visions to foreshow the actors and events detailed in Gibbon's history; or, in other words, what the principle is on which he holds that such symbols must be used to represent such actors and events. Whether, indeed, he ever entered into an inquiry respecting it is left in uncertainty. It turns out, however, from his construction of the seals, that he regards similarity as the principle of representation, instead of analogy; or, in other words, that he holds that the symbol is a specimen in kind of the actor, action, or event, which it is employed to foreshow. He thus, in fact, takes for granted the point on which the whole interpretation turns, and founds his explication, as absolutely as any one else, on a preconceived or tacitly assumed theory. Before it could be legitimately determined by him that certain symbols are such as God would undoubtedly use, if he designed to make an intelligible revelation of certain events, he should have instituted an inquiry respecting the law of symbolization, or the principle on which symbols are employed in the prophecies to foreshow the future; and he had ample means of deciding that question in the numerous interpretations that are given in the prophecies themselves by the revealing Spirit, in which all the principal symbols, so far from representing actors, actions, or events, of the same kind as themselves, are employed to represent others of different and analogous natures. Such is the relation in which the stars, candlesticks, fine white linen, incense, and horns of the wild beast, that are interpreted in the Apocalypse, and the image, the tree, the four great beasts, the ram, the goat, and others of Daniel, are employed. The exceptions to this law are not numerous, and have their ground in an impossibility of finding a proper symbol of a different order from themselves to represent the actors to be foreshown, in the peculiar relations in which they were to appear; as, under the sixth seal, the kings and their armies and subjects, are used to symbolize their own classes in order to exhibit the alarm and consternation they are to feel at the advent of the Lamb to judge and punish them, which no symbols

taken from the brute or inanimate world could have any adaptation to express. The principle on which he proceeds is thus altogether mistaken. He gave to his preliminary inquiries an entirely wrong direction, and his commentary accordingly, so far as he adheres to his theory, is founded on a false basis.

This theory, indeed, instead of being in any degree original, is that on which Mr. Elliott proceeded, and the reasons he gives for its adoption are the same, and are similarly stated, as those which are presented by that writer for embracing it. Thus Mr. E. says:—

“In commencing his researches, there were two preliminary *presumptions* on which he judged he might safely proceed. The *one* presumption was, that on the hypothesis of the fortunes of the Roman world and Christendom, from St. John's time down to the consummation, being the subjects of Apocalyptic figuration, the eras successively chosen by the Divine Spirit for delineation, must have been the most important and eventful in the history of Christendom; the *other*, that the emblems introduced into and constituting such figurative picture, must have been emblems in every case suitable to the era and subject, and in considerable measure characteristic and distinctive.”—Preface, p. vii.

“It may, perhaps, be useful to set before the reader a brief general statement of the *principles and plan* of the following *exposition* of the Apocalypse and prophecy.

“Its subject matter I have *presumed* to be *the fortunes of the world and of the church*, from the time of the revelation being given, that is, from the time of John's imprisonment to the end of all things” . . . “In the divine foreshowing of which subject *I have felt persuaded, and have carried out my exposition on the persuasion, that the two following rules must have been observed*; first, that *the epochs* and events selected successively for prefiguration would be the most important and eventful; secondly, that the emblems representing them should be clear, characteristic, and distinctive. *Such would be the case were a master mind among men to develope the great general subject* in a series of descriptive sketches or pictures. How, then, can we suppose it otherwise in the prefigurations of the omniscient Spirit?”—Pp. 30, 31.

He also regarded Gibbon's history as presenting an extraordinary narrative of the events that are foreshadowed in the visions.

“It is to be admired that divine wisdom should so have overruled the intellectual tendencies of a mind like Gibbon's, as that it should have been directed in these latter days to the development of the same period, and nearly the same subject, as the larger half of

the Apocalyptic prophecy. It is scarce needful, I presume, to suggest his peculiar qualifications as an illustrator and a witness, endowed as he was with powers of research and memory very rare, and an absolute enthusiasm in his subject, such as precisely fitted him best for searching out historic truth, even when obscurest; endowed, too, with a comprehensiveness of view and philosophic sagacity which led him, instinctively almost, to mark the relations of things, trace results to their causes, and amidst the multiplicity of details appreciate the real importance and grand bearing of events and epochs; and yet further, characterized by a turn of mind and imagination eminently dramatic and picturesque, such as to suggest a developement of his general subject with no little dramatic unity of effect, and a *grouping and painting* of the details in graphic descriptions that approach as near almost as descriptive language can do, to the mode of exhibiting them, here chosen, of actual pictures. Thus was the infidel Gibbon prepared to become, unconsciously, the best illustrator of no small part of the heavenly prophecy. The advantage derivable from his book, *to the right perception of the meaning* of the Apocalyptic visions, can alone, indeed, be fully appreciated by the expositor."—Pp. 33, 34.

The views and expressions of the passage transcribed from Mr. Barnes present so striking a resemblance to these that they would naturally be thought to have been suggested by them, had not Mr. B. so expressly represented his as the result of his own independent inquiry. It may be added that this theory, in place of being peculiar, even to Mr. Elliott, as far as the seals and trumpets are concerned, is essentially the same as has been held by a long train of expositors; and the passages cited from Gibbon are the same as have been often quoted to sustain them.

But Mr. Barnes has not only missed the great law of symbolization as it is indicated in the interpretations that are given in the prophecies themselves; he has adopted very mistaken notions also of the nature and reality of the symbols. Thus he exhibits them in some instances as probably, at least, mere pictures or drawings, not real agents or objects, such as their names properly denote. He says, in regard to them generally,—

"These things were so made to pass before him, that they had *the aspect* of reality, and he could *copy and describe* them as real. It is not necessary to suppose that there was any representation to the bodily *eye*; but they had to his *mind* such a reality that he could describe them as *pictures* or symbols."—P. 130.

"A question has arisen as to the mode of representation here; whether what John saw in these visions was a series of *pictures*

drawn on successive portions of the volume, as one seal was broken after another, or whether the description of the horses and of the events was *written* on the volume, so that John read it himself or heard it read by another; or whether the opening of the seal was merely the *occasion* of a scenic representation, in which a succession of horses was introduced with a written statement of the events which are referred to. Nothing indeed is said by which this can be determined with certainty; but the most probable supposition would seem to be that there was some *pictorial* representation in form and appearance, such as he describes in the opening of the six seals. In favor of this it may be observed, (1.) That, according to the interpretation of ver. 1, it was something *in* or *on* the volume—since he was invited to draw nearer, in order that he might contemplate it. (2.) Each one of the things under the five first seals, where John uses the word ‘saw,’ is capable of being represented by a picture or painting. (3.) The language used is not such as would have been employed if he had merely *read* the description, or had *heard* it read. (4.) The supposition that the pictorial representation was not *in* the volume, but the opening of the seal was the occasion merely of causing a scenic representation to pass before his mind, is unnatural and forced. What would be the use of a sealed volume in that case? What the use of the writing within and without?”—Pp. 163, 164.

This, however, is not only unauthorized, but is inconsistent with John’s representations and subversive of the prophecy. In the first place: The horses, horsemen, and those in relation to whom they acted, are exhibited as real and living agents, not as mere pictures. The terms by which they are designated are not descriptive of pictures. The animals are denominated horses, not delineations or likenesses of horses; and the persons who sat on them are represented as men holding weapons, exerting acts, and producing effects as real living agents, not as mere drawings, or lifeless similitudes. They must be taken as real therefore, not as mere shadows or figures of a wholly different nature. In the next place: The acts that are ascribed to them are not predicable of mere pictured agents, and many of them not susceptible even of delineation in a single picture. Thus the first rider, after appearing on the scene and *being beheld by the apostle*, received a crown, and went forth conquering and to conquer. How could such acts be represented by a mere picture? The horseman, moreover, appeared probably—not in the sky—but on the earth, which was to be the scene of the agency he represented, and was doubtless, therefore, seen by the apostle to traverse a part of its surface. But how could that be represented in a picture? A

pictorial representation of the acts of the second horse and horseman would be still more impracticable. It is said of them, and there *went out* another, a red horse ; and it was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another ; and there was given unto him a great sword. The horse and horseman of the fourth seal are in like manner represented as *in motion*, and hades is said to have followed them. Many of the symbols, moreover, are of species that are absolutely incapable of representation in pictures, as they were perceptible by the ear only, not by the eye, such as voices and thunders. As they have no figures, and are not objects of sight, they could not be delineated by colors. To suppose, therefore, that the symbols were pictures, is to suppose that there really were none of those classes, which are very numerous, and among the most important of the whole series. The ascriptions and utterances of the living creatures, elders, and angels, for example, belong to them. The supposition implies, therefore, that there cannot have been any such homage as that, chap. iv., of the living creatures, who cry perpetually, "Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come ;" and of the elders : "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created ;" nor any such hymns as those, chap. v. : "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." But to suppose these and others of the kind to be unreal, is to offer the most direct contradiction to the prophet, and to treat his testimony, in respect to those which were objects of vision, as unworthy of reliance. In the third place : His supposition is as inconsistent with the relation in which pictures are used as it is with the nature of the symbols. They are not only taken usually from things that already exist, or have existed, not from things that are not yet called into being ; but they are used almost universally in the commemoration of the past, not in the representation of the future. If, therefore, all the symbols of the visions could have been delineated to the eye, the use of such pictures would have been unsuitable to a prophetic representation of agents and events that had not yet come into existence. His supposition is thus, in every respect, erroneous. And this, unhappily, is but one of many instances in which, from the want of just views of the nature of symbols and the principles on which they are employed, he indulges

in conjectures and proceeds on assumptions that in effect overturn his own interpretations and confound the whole prophecy.

He, also, in the passages we have quoted, and in many others, represents it as uncertain and improbable that the symbols were really presented to the prophet's senses. But that is forbidden by the apostle's language, as he expressly states that he *saw* those which had a material form, and were perceptible by the eye; and heard those that were perceptible only by the ear. It was the peculiarity of prophetic vision that the seer was miraculously put into a state by which the symbols and their acts and effects were presented to his senses, so that he had as real and absolute a perception of them by the eye and ear, and consciousness that he beheld and heard them, as that he saw and heard the most impressive objects and phenomena of the material world that naturally passed within his observation. To suppose them merely conceptional, is to suppose them without any exterior and independent reality, and to divest them of their adaptation to represent exterior and real agents and events. But the vision of the first chapter, for example, was to the apostle as wholly different from the most exact and vivid conception of it which a reader of his description gains, as the cause that presented it to him was, from his description of the scene by which the reader's conception of it is excited. There can be no just appreciation or correct interpretation of the symbols unless they are contemplated as they are represented by the prophets, as real and sensible objects, as truly as any others are that are external to us, act on us, and are perceptible by our senses.

Entering on his task as he thus did, without any clear views of what it was that he was to accomplish—without any just notion of the nature of symbols, without any inquiry into the principle on which they are employed, and with the singular persuasion that they are to be interpreted by history rather than by their nature and the explications which the Spirit of inspiration has given of them—it is not to be supposed that Mr. B. could give a correct or consistent exposition of the Apocalypse. His work is accordingly marked by great vagueness and inconsistency of construction, and palpable and fatal errors. He founds his interpretations on no law; he has no settled rule of procedure; he passes from one theory to another, as the impulse of the moment determines him; loses himself often and the prophecy in dim generalities; and seldom, apparently, has much assurance that his constructions are right. A few examples of his interpretations will enable our readers to see the truth of this representation.

Thus, in treating of the vision recorded in the first chapter, he

endeavors to free the description from what he regards as an incongruity in representing a sword, as proceeding from Christ's mouth, by intimating that there, in fact, was none; that the language is tropical, and has a wholly different meaning.

"The only difficulty here is in the apparently incongruous representation of a sword seeming to proceed from the mouth; but it is not, perhaps, necessary to suppose that John *means to say* that he *saw* such an image. He heard him speak; he felt the penetrating power of his words; and they were *as if* a sharp sword proceeded from his mouth. They penetrated deep into the soul, and as he looked on him it seemed *as if* a sword came from his mouth. Perhaps it is not necessary to suppose that there was even *any* visible representation of this—either of a sword, or of the breath from his mouth appearing to take this form, as Prof. Stuart supposes. It may be wholly a figurative representation, as Heinrichs and Ewald suppose. Though there were visible and impressive symbols of his majesty and glory presented to the eyes, it is not necessary to suppose that there were visible symbols of his *words*."—P. 72.

But this is directly to set aside the apostle's testimony, who states as explicitly as he describes any other particular of Christ's appearance that "out of his mouth went"—not the appearance of a sword, nor a sword simply, but—"a sharp two-edged sword;" a sword of a peculiar form and use. To assume, therefore, that no such sword proceeded from his mouth, is to assume that the apostle gives a false description of his appearance. The supposition that he ascribed to him such a tongue, because of the piercing impression made on him by the words Christ uttered, is groundless; as those words were not threatening, or expressive of displeasure, but simply announced him as the Alpha and Omega, and directed the apostle to write *what he saw* in a book, and send it to the seven churches of Asia. Instead of the words, indeed, the apostle expressly states that it was the sight of the Redeemer that overwhelmed him, and caused him to fall as dead at his feet. The supposition that the language is figurative, is equally mistaken; as it is a universal law of propositions that the nominative, or term of which the affirmation is made, is used literally; and that term is in this instance the two-edged sword—"and a sharp two-edged sword proceeded out of his mouth." If there were, then, any figure in the expression—which there is not—it would be in the affirmative part of the proposition—"proceeded out of his mouth," not in the nominative. An acquaintance, however, with a great law of language like this, which would have withheld him from a large number of the most preposterous and fatal blunders, it were vain to expect from Mr. Barnes. He thus, at his first

attempt at explication, assumes a license that, if legitimate, is fatal to the whole prophecy: for he can with no more propriety set aside this symbol, on the ground that it does not seem to him to be becoming, than any other in the whole series of the visions. If incongruity is a reason for questioning their reality, how can he suppose that death really rode a horse, and was followed by hades; that the dragon drew one third of the stars with its tail, and cast them to the earth; that the horses from the Euphrates had the heads of lions; that out of their mouths issued fire, smoke, and brimstone; and that their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads with which they hurt! There is a great number of the symbols indeed that deviate in an equal measure from nature. Fortunately, however, Mr. Barnes's fastidiousness in this instance is not a rule to him in the treatment of other symbols that are equally obnoxious to his objection. He felt no scruples in admitting the reality and propriety of the seven horns and seven eyes that are ascribed to the Lamb, in the vision of the fifth chapter. He says of the former:—

"The propriety of this symbol is laid in the fact that the strength of an animal is in the horn, and that it is by this that he obtains a victory over other animals!" And of the seven eyes—"symbols of intelligence—John does not say anything as to the relative arrangement of the horns and eyes on the Lamb; and it is vain to conjecture how it was. The whole representation is symbolical, and we may understand the meaning of the symbol, without being able to form an exact conception of the figure as it appeared to him."

These considerations, Mr. B. should have seen, are equally applicable to the first vision, and he should have been withheld by them from attempting, by erasing one of its principal features, to bring it into conformity with his notions of what is congruous. This is one of many instances in which he treats the symbols as of doubtful reality, or as nothing more than vague appearances, "*as if*" they but seemed to be what it is said they were.

Mr. Barnes, indeed, instead of a delicate sense of beauty, harmony, and fitness, seems essentially deficient in the power of discerning them, and receiving their impressions. He has, for example, it would seem, no clear apprehension of the great laws of analogy. He does not see that, in order to a proper correlation between that which is represented by a symbol and the symbol itself, the former must be in the sphere to which it belongs, what the symbol itself is in its peculiar sphere; that if the symbol is a living agent, that which is represented must also be a living agent; that if the symbol is an attribute, an act, or effect, that which it denotes must be also:—that the relation, in short, of that which is symbolized, to the

things with which it is immediately connected, must be the same as those of the symbol to the resembling things to which it has a like relationship. He accordingly either is not aware, or else he regards it as of no consideration, that these great laws are exemplified in all the symbols, parables, and allegories that are interpreted in the sacred volume. And consequently, when he has contemplated a symbol and ascertained its physical nature, he has no principle to guide him in determining from it what the characters must be of that which it is employed to represent. He is as likely to run into the grossest incongruities as to hit on a construction that is in harmony with the laws of symbolic representation. This is exemplified in his views of the import of the living creatures.

"In Ezekiel they are either designed as poetic representations of the majesty of God, or of his providential government, showing what *sustains* his throne:—symbols denoting intelligence, vigilance, the rapidity and directness with which the divine commands are executed, and the energy and firmness with which the government of God is administered. . . . If this interpretation be admitted, then the most natural explanation to be given of the four living beings, is to suppose that they are symbolical beings designed to furnish *some representation of the government of God*; to illustrate, as it were, that on which the divine government *rests*, or which constitutes its support—to wit, power, intelligence, vigilance, energy."—P. 136.

"They are in themselves well adapted to be representatives of the great principles of the divine government or of the divine providential dealings."—P. 138.

"If these views of the meaning of these symbols are correct, then the idea which would be conveyed to the mind of John, and the idea, therefore, which should be conveyed to our minds, is, that the government of God is energetic, firm, intelligent, and that, in the execution of its purposes, it is *rapid*, like the unobstructed flight of an eagle, or *protective*, like the care of the eagle for its young. When, in the subsequent parts of the vision, these living creatures are represented as offering praise and adoration to him that sits on the throne, the meaning would be in accordance with this representation, that all *the acts of the divine government* do, as if they were *personified*, unite in the praise which the redeemed and the angels ascribe to God."—P. 142.

But this is, in the first place, altogether inconsistent with the laws of analogy and incongruous. Had Mr. Barnes thought proper to inquire into the laws of representation, as they are exemplified in the interpretations that are given in the Scriptures of symbols, parables,

and allegories, he would have found that no one is more indisputable and fundamental than that agents represent agents; and they have no adaptation to represent things of another class. The relations of an agent are wholly different from those of an act. The one is a cause, the other an effect. The one may have intelligence, volition, and design; the other can have none. His construction, therefore, is against the first great law of symbolization, more important than any other, and demonstrated by considerations so obvious as to render it surprising that any one who has given the slightest attention to the principles on which parables, allegories, and symbols, are used in the Scriptures, could have overlooked it.

In the next place, it is altogether incongruous and self-contradictory to suppose these symbols to be representatives and personifications of the acts of God, as the lawgiver and ruler of his kingdom. What can be meant, on that supposition, by their covering their faces with two of their wings? Are the acts and dispensations of God conscious of their inferiority to him, and penetrated with an awe or humility that is properly expressed by such an act? But besides that extraordinary solecism, it implies that in the acts of homage the living creatures offered to God as their Creator, and in the ascriptions they sang of their redemption by the blood of Christ, *God worshipped himself, and acknowledged and celebrated his own redemption by the blood of the Lamb*; for if the living creatures in that worship and acknowledgment only personate the acts of God, the acts they personate are plainly acts in which God worships himself as Creator, and ascribes worthiness to the Lamb, to conduct the revelation that was about to be made, because he had redeemed him by his death! What conception can transcend this in the enormity of its implications? To detect its impropriety, however, is, we take it, quite beyond the scope of Mr. Barnes's powers. He sees nothing in it that is not perfectly compatible with truth, and appropriate to the wisdom and sanctitude of the Most High.

In the third place, if it were legitimate, it would prove the prophecy to be unsusceptible of a demonstrative interpretation; for if the symbols are not employed on the principles of analogy; if there is no uniform relation between the representative and that which it denotes; if intelligent and active agents may symbolize acts, dispensations, and laws, as well as living beings who exert actions; and if actions, dispensations, and events, on the other hand, may represent living agents, as well as the acts of such agents or dispensations, then there can be no certainty whatever of interpretation. If there is nothing in the nature of the representative by which it can be determined to what class even that which is represented belongs, whether

to living acting intelligences, mere acts, or physical events, then there can be no means of reasoning from the one to the other; and interpretation must be left to mere conjecture, chance, or caprice.

There is no medium, therefore, between subverting the whole prophecy or adhering to the great law of symbolization, that living intelligent agents represent living intelligent agents; and hence, in regarding the living creatures as intelligences. And that being settled, they must also be regarded as intelligences of the human race, inasmuch as they unite with the elders in the ascription of worthiness to the Lamb, because he had been slain for them, and had redeemed them by his blood, and made them kings and priests who are to reign on the earth.

This example shows how indispensable to the interpreter a knowledge is of the laws of analogy and of symbolization. To attempt to explain the prophecy without an intimate acquaintance with them is as absurd and presumptuous as it were to undertake the solution of an intricate system of mathematical truths, without any knowledge of the principles on which they are founded. Of this, however, Mr. Barnes has not the remotest conception; and the consequence is, that he falls at every step into the most crude and repulsive errors, which a moderate share of proper culture and care would have enabled him to avoid.

He proceeds in the interpretation of the living creatures, the lamps, and the horns and eyes of the Lamb, on the assumption that they are of a different nature from that which is represented by them. In his exposition, however, of the first four seals, he quits that theory, and maintains very strenuously that the agents and events that are symbolized must be of the same nature as those that are employed to represent them.

"The whole description, so far as it is a representation of triumph, is a representation of the triumph of war, not of the gospel of peace. All the symbols in the opening of the first four seals, when the horseman appears, are such as are usually connected with war. It is the march of empire, the movement of military power." —P. 167.

He thus assumes that the representative agents and acts must of course be of the kind which they are employed to represent; that military conquerors can only symbolize military conquerors; that chiefs that aspire to supreme power, excite civil war, and cause bloodshed, can only symbolize such aspiring and bloody chiefs; and that famine must represent famine, pestilence stand for pestilence, and wild beasts for wild beasts. But, on that principle, he should take the candlesticks to stand for candlesticks, not for churches; and

the stars for stars, not for messengers of the churches. He should regard the fiery whirlwind, the burning mountain, the wormwood star, the stroke on the sun, the locusts, and the monster horses of the trumpets, as denoting agents and events of their own order, not of different and analogous natures. He should have interpreted the dragon also, the woman, the manchild, the beast of ten horns, and the woman who rode it, as representing agents precisely like themselves, and their several acts as denoting acts of the same species, and exerted in the same relations, and for the same objects. If not, the reason he here gives for his construction is without authority. The mere fact that symbols are taken from a certain sphere of life or society, is not of itself proof that that which they represent is also of the same sphere, unless that is, from its very nature, the law of symbolization. But that is not its law. The symbols of Daniel's vision of the four great beasts were taken from the animal world, and the acts ascribed to them were appropriate to their peculiar natures, yet they were not employed to represent the rise and agency on the earth of such animals, but were used to symbolize powerful, ferocious, and bloody monarchs, who assailed, conquered, and slaughtered men, instead of brutes; and the reason that they were selected for that purpose was, that they in their sphere presented a striking analogy to the human conquerors and tyrants whom they were used to represent. A large part of the symbols of the sixth seal, and those of the first and second trumpets, are taken from the inanimate world; but it does not follow that the agents and phenomena which they represent belong to the same department of nature and are of the same kind. Instead, they denote agents and events of a wholly different sphere, and they are used to represent them, because, while belonging to another class, they present an obvious and impressive resemblance to the human agents, acts, and events, which it is their office to symbolize. And such is the great law of symbols, and must be held to be the law of those of the first four seals, unless it can be shown that there are no analogous agents which they can naturally represent. But that cannot be shown. There certainly is nothing in the nature of armed and conquering horsemen that disqualifies them from representing men of a different class who act an analogous part in their sphere, any more than there is in the nature of ferocious beasts, fiery whirlwinds, and volcanic mountains, that unfits them to be the representatives of combinations of violent and destructive men. Nor is there any more difficulty in finding agents in the ecclesiastical world who act a part in their sphere that resembles that of the armed horsemen of those seals, than there is in finding combinations of

men in the civil and military sphere who answer to the great beasts of Daniel's vision, and to the fiery whirlwind, volcanic mountain, wormwood star, and many others of John's. This, however, Mr. Barnes doubts. "If there is little probability that this," the first horseman, "refers to Christ, there is still less that it refers to the ministers of the gospel; for such a symbol is employed nowhere else to represent an order of ministers, nor do the circumstances find a fulfilment in them. The minister of the gospel is the herald of peace, and is employed in the service of the Prince of Peace. He cannot well be represented by a warrior, nor is he in the Scriptures. In itself considered, there is nothing more unlike or incongruous than a warrior going forth to conquest with hostile arms, and a minister of Christ."—P. 168.

Yet Paul seems to have thought that there was a very marked resemblance between the conflicts of a minister of Christ and a soldier or warrior. He said to Timothy, with express reference to his office as a minister, "This charge I commit unto thee, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest *war a good warfare*;" and he exhorted him accordingly, to "fight the good fight of faith." He says, in respect to his own labors and conflicts, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course. I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day." And he exhibits the whole Christian life as a struggle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places, in which a victory is to be gained only by the armor of God, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit.—Eph. vi. 11–17. Christ also, in the Apocalypse, in his addresses to the messengers of the seven churches, exhibits the work to which they were called as a war or armed conflict, in which a crown of life was to reward those who were victors. There is no want of analogy, then, between a minister of the gospel who labors amid opposition, enmities, and strifes, to bring revolting men to become obedient subjects of Christ's kingdom, and warriors who go forth to subdue revolting or hostile tribes, and bring them to a peaceful subjection to the monarchs in whose behalf they act.

Nor is there any want of resemblance between the horsemen of the second, third, and fourth seals, and the ministers of the church in the third, fourth, fifth, and subsequent centuries. Instead, the usurping, contentious, apostate, and tyrannical ecclesiastics of those

ages, presented a striking counterpart to the factious, aspiring, and bloody leaders of the Roman empire, from the time of Commodus to the accession of Constantine. These aspiring, imperious, and destroying ecclesiastics were, in their sphere, what the ambitious and bloody usurpers and oppressors of the empire were in theirs; and they are the only class that presents to them such a correspondence. It is not simply admissible, therefore, to regard those symbols as representatives of these ecclesiastics, but it is as obligatory as it is to regard any other symbols that are not expressly interpreted in the prophecy, as standing for agents and acts of a sphere and class that are analogous to themselves. And Mr. Barnes, accordingly, in rejecting this construction, sets aside one of the most indubitable and essential of the laws of symbolization.

In his interpretation of the first five seals he, in the main, follows Mr. Elliott. Of the sixth, he frames a construction chiefly for himself, on the supposition that the agents and events represented by the symbols taken from the physical world are of a different order from those representatives themselves; but runs into equal errors and incongruities; as he regards the sun, moon, and stars, as symbols of the Gothic powers, that were external to the empire, and exhibits it as the design of the vision to indicate the consternation of the Roman population—not to represent revolutions and commotions, and the advent of the Lamb of God, which are to be the causes of that consternation.

"The obvious and natural application of the opening of the seal has not been adverted to. I shall suggest it, because it is the most natural and obvious, and seems to be demanded by the explanations given of the previous seals. It is in one word the impending judgments from the invasions of the northern hordes of Goths and Vandals, threatening the breaking up of the Roman empire, *the gathering of the storm*, and *the hovering of those barbarians on the borders of the empire*; the approaches which they made from time to time towards the capital, though restrained as yet from taking it; *the tempest of wrath* that was, as it were, *suspended* yet on the frontiers, until the events recorded in the next chapter should occur; then bursting forth in wrath in successive blasts, as denoted by the first four trumpets of the seventh seal, when the empire was entirely overthrown by the Goths and Vandals. The precise point of time which I suppose this seal occupies, is that *succeeding* the last persecution. It embraces *the preparatory arrangements* of those hordes of invaders; *their gathering on the frontier of the empire*, *their threatening approaches* towards the capital, *and the formation of such vast armies as would produce universal consternation.*"

But this is embarrassed by several fatal objections. In the first place, it exhibits the earth, sun, moon, and stars as symbols of the Gothic princes and armies, instead of the Roman rulers and population, whom they indisputably represent, and whom Mr. B. himself treats them as representing in his interpretation of the first four trumpets. As it was the earth, at least, of the Roman empire—if not the earth at large—that was shaken by the earthquake, and darkened by the obscuration of the sun and moon, it is the rulers of the Roman earth, at least—if not of the world at large—who are symbolized by the sun, moon, and stars, and their destruction that is foreshown by the passing away of the heavens. To treat them as denoting the Gothic princes and armies, and especially anterior to their entrance into the empire, is to contradict the clearest indications of the prophecy. On Mr. Barnes's construction, it was the overthrow of the Gothic rulers and armies that those symbols portended, not that of the Roman world; and it was the consternation of those foreign tribes, while hovering on the skirts of the empire, that the alarm and terror of the kings and armies symbolized, not the terror and dismay of the Roman population. Is it not singular that so plain an element of his construction should have escaped his notice?

In the next place: He interprets these symbols as not, in fact, representing the actual occurrence of corresponding revolutions and catastrophes in the Roman world, but as merely designed to indicate the consternation which the prospect of their occurrence was to awaken in the Roman people. But that is wholly unauthorized and subversive of the prophecy. He can no more treat these symbols as intended merely to indicate an alarm of the people at the signs of impending calamities, instead of political revolutions themselves, the fall of princes, and the overthrow of governments that are in their sphere what such catastrophes of the heavenly bodies and the heavens themselves are in theirs, than he can treat the symbols of the seals, trumpets, and vials as signifying nothing more than the thoughts, fears, or alarms of the nations, instead of the agencies and catastrophes in the religious and political world, which they are employed to foreshow. What considerations, for example, can he allege to show that the earthquake, the darkening of the sun, the crimsoning of the moon, the fall of the stars, and the passing away of the heavens, in this vision, do not symbolize any actual events of a corresponding nature in the political world, but only foreshow an extreme terror and dismay at the threat of such events; than can be brought to show that the bloody and fiery tempest, and the burning mountain of the first and second trumpets, do not symbolize actual invasions, wars, and slaughters, but only a fear of such calamities?

There is not a solitary symbol in the visions, that may not by this expedient be as effectually erased by him as this is from the prophecy.

In the third place, the confutation of his construction is completed by the fact that the consternation of the kings and their armies, which he refers to the earthquake and obscuration and fall of the heavenly bodies, the prophecy itself refers to the advent of the avenging Lamb, and apprehension of the wrath he is to inflict on his enemies. "And the kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?" It was thus the appearance of the Lamb in the clouds to take vengeance on them that caused their consternation, and it was from him that they desired to hide themselves; not from symbols—of which there were none in the vision—of Gothic armies hovering on the line of the Danube! What an extraordinary license to set aside this great feature of the vision as of no reality, but only designed to show that the alarm of the Romans at the approach of the Gothic invasion was to be as great as that of kings and armies would be at a visible advent of the Son of God to inflict his wrath on them! His construction assumes that the advent of the Lamb in the skies to take vengeance, symbolized the advent of the Gothic invaders on the Danube; and the consternation of the kings and armies at his presence, represented the alarm of the Roman population at the hovering of those barbarian hordes on the skirts of the empire. What conception more unbecoming the majesty of the Redeemer could he have advanced! What more repulsive solecism could he have invented!

His construction of the seal is thus altogether erroneous, both as it respects the events that are indicated by it and the period of their occurrence. The great catastrophes of the natural world that are used as the symbols, represent catastrophes in the political world that correspond to them in nature and extent; and the consternation of the kings and their armies, and desire to hide themselves from the presence of the avenging Lamb, indicate that those catastrophes are to be followed by his advent in the clouds to take vengeance on his enemies; and show, therefore, that the period of the seal is to coincide with that of the vials, and is immediately to precede the coming of the Son of God in the clouds to destroy the anti-christian hosts. And this is in harmony with the revelations under the preceding

seals. The symbols of those seals are to be considered as representing the whole series of men in the church who exert the agencies that answer to theirs; and as foreshadowing their several classes, therefore, to the present time; as there are now true ministers who win subjects to Christ, and usurpers, apostates, and destroyers also in the sacred office, as truly as there were in the ages in which those seals had their first verification; while the fifth indicates expressly that its period is to continue to the last persecution, which, it is known from other parts of the prophecy, is immediately to precede the Redeemer's advent.

These errors—which are only a few of the most conspicuous that occur in the first half of his volume—indicate the general character of his commentary. The notice we propose of others into which he has fallen must be postponed to another number.

2. *THE GEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.* By Sir Henry T. De La Beche, C.B., F.R.S., &c., Director General of the Geological Survey of the United Kingdom. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. 1851.

THE design of this work is to furnish the student of geology with the necessary aids in the observation and study of the facts of the science. It is descriptive and practical accordingly, not theoretical, and is one of the most judiciously arranged, comprehensive, and valuable treatises on the subject. The author gives in the Introduction a brief view of the great elements of which the crust of the globe consists, and the order in which the formations are arranged; and presents in the body of the work a minute and graphic view of all the geological causes that are now in activity on the earth, and the processes to which they are giving birth; traces the present condition of the continents, islands, and seas; and points out the changes to which they have been subjected at former periods. Among the subjects he treats at length, some of the most important and interesting are the decomposition and disintegration of rocks by the action of air, water, and other chemical forces, and transportation to the sea; the preservation of vegetable and animal remains in the strata and caves; the formation of coral reefs and islands; the agency of ice in the transportation of detrital matter, and the modification of the temperature; the chief volcanoes of the continents and islands, and their products; earthquakes; the rise and subsidence of land; submarine forests; the coal formations; the temperature of the earth; the agency of internal fires in the ejection of rocks, the dislocation of the strata, and the elevation of the mountains; and, finally, the denudations and removals

of strata that have taken place by the agency of the ocean since their upheaval. The facts detailed on the several branches of the subject are sufficiently numerous and well presented; and a comprehensive index indicates to the reader the pages on which they are to be found.

3. *THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN*, Expounded for those who search the Scriptures, by E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the Original, by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, Author of *Typology of Scripture*, &c. Volume First. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1852.

THE hope of a critical and authoritative exposition of the Apocalypse, which the rank of the author as a commentator on the Old Testament seemed to justify, is, unfortunately, not realized in this work. He presents in the Introduction an able statement of the conclusive proofs furnished by the prophecy itself and the writers of the early centuries, that it was communicated to John, and written at the time to which it was referred by Irenæus, towards the close of the reign of Domitian; but his exposition falls much below what might justly have been expected from his genius and learning. Its chief characteristics are, first, that the import which he assigns to the visions is not drawn directly and absolutely from the symbols themselves, but is founded rather on passages chiefly in the Old Testament, in which similar terms and expressions occur, the meaning of which is to be determined by the laws of philology. He refers uniformly to what he denominates the fundamental or first passage in the Scriptures, in which the same terms and phrases are used, and deduces the meaning of the symbol mainly from that. Of the peculiar laws of symbolization he takes no cognizance, and has no suspicion even of their existence. He could have proceeded, however, on no more mistaken principle, as he would have easily seen, had he attempted to apply it to the symbols that are interpreted in the prophecy itself. The seven golden candlesticks, for example, beheld in the first vision, instead of representing, as the Redeemer explains them, the seven churches of Asia, would, on his theory, be representatives of mere candlesticks, or other light-bearers used in a place or places consecrated to the worship of God; for that is what the term denotes in "the fundamental passage," as he calls it, in the Old Testament, and in many others that follow it. The seven stars, in like manner, in place of symbolizing the messengers of the churches, would stand for the lights of the seven candlesticks in a temple or place set apart for God's worship. So incense, also, instead

of representing the prayers of saints, would denote literal incense burning in a censer in a temple, contemporaneously with the offering of prayer by worshippers. He thus divests the symbols, in a large degree, of their representative office, and interprets them as he would had there been no exhibition of them in vision, but the prophet had merely predicted in language that such agents, exercising such agencies, would appear on the earth. Had John, in the same form as Christ foretold his own death and resurrection, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews, simply announced, that shortly a white horse should appear on the earth, and he that sat on him, holding a bow, should receive a crown, and go forth conquering and to conquer, Hengstenberg would have interpreted it precisely as he now does the symbol of the first seal, as indicating an infliction of destroying judgments on those whom the personage denoted by the rider was to conquer. So, also, the second, third, and fourth seals. He sees nothing indicated by their symbols but blood, discord, scarcity, slaughter, pestilence, and death.

Secondly: He does not regard the symbols as representing specific agents or classes of agents, that rise at a particular era, exercise an agency that corresponds to that ascribed to the symbols, and that, exclusively of all others, accomplish the prophecy; but instead, holds that they simply foreshow that judgments or deliverances, such as they represent, are characteristic of God's providence over the world, and are verified, therefore, by any one of the judgments or deliverances of the same general classes, without reference to their authors or periods, as much as by any other. Thus he maintains that the first four seals simply show that terrible wars, discords, scarcities, pestilences, and slaughters, were to be inflicted on the nations of the world, and that they have their fulfilment, therefore, as much in any one set or series of those calamities as in any other, and as much in any one part of the world as in any other. And so, also, of the trumpets; they, according to him, foreshow nothing new. They only indicate by new media, or in new and more startling forms, what had already been revealed through the seals, that great and terrible judgments were to be inflicted on the guilty nations of the earth. 1. But this is altogether arbitrary. Why should it any more be denied that the symbols of the seals and trumpets have their accomplishment in certain individuals or combinations and successions of persons and events, of particular periods, to the exclusion of all others, than it should that the captivity of the Israelites at Babylon, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews among the nations, had their fulfilment in the agency of certain combinations of men at specific periods, to the exclusion of all others? 2. It

is in contradiction to constructions that are given in the Scriptures themselves of successive symbols. On the principle on which he proceeds, the four great beasts of Daniel's vision should not be considered as symbols of different and successive conquering dynasties, but only as varying representatives of conquerors and conquests that had their counterpart as much in any one of the symbols as in any other. They are interpreted, however, in the prophecy as denoting different and successive dynasties. And, 3d, according to the principle on which he proceeds, it would be impossible to foreshow by a symbol the rise of any individual agent or class of agents, and occurrence of any particular events, to the exclusion of all others of the same classes; for what symbols can be conceived better adapted to that office than those that are employed in the Apocalypse? But that is as groundless and absurd as it were to assert that no prediction can be made through language that has an exclusive relationship to an individual person, a particular class, or a specific event. Why should the one be any more impossible than the other? It is in contradiction also to the interpretations that are given in the Scriptures of the symbols. The four metals of Nebuchadnezzar's image are interpreted of the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman dynasties, in exclusion of all others. The ram and goat are explained of the Persian and Greek, in exclusion of all others. The seven candlesticks are explained as symbolizing the seven churches of Asia, in contradistinction from all other churches; and the stars as symbolizing the messengers of those churches alone, not those of any others. Under the guidance of these false views, Hengstenberg thus strikes from the prophecy its distinguishing features, and converts its most marked and peculiar revelations into vague generalities and repetitions under different forms of the same measures of judgment or mercy.

In the third place, as a natural consequence of these views of the office of symbols, he contemplates the visions rather in a practical than a prophetic relation, or interprets them much as he does the Psalms, as designed simply to foreshow the great characteristics of the government God was to exercise over the world till the coming of Christ; and as having, therefore, at every step, much the same reference to any one person as to any other, who finds himself in the general circumstances which the prediction contemplates. Such, especially, is the character of his exposition of the letters to the churches of Asia, in which he presents, however, many just and excellent views, and makes many appropriate and useful applications. He follows Bengel in the main, and quotes him to excess.

Although, however, this volume is not an accurate exposition of

that part of the Apocalypse of which it treats, the reader will, nevertheless, find himself repaid for its perusal, by the intimate acquaintance it exhibits with the ancient Scriptures, and the decisive proofs, notwithstanding its errors, it still everywhere displays, that the prophecy has an intelligible meaning, and presents clearer and more impressive views than any other part of the sacred volume, of the great scheme of government God was and is to exercise over the world till the moment arrives of the fall of the antichristian powers. On the appearance of the remaining volume we hope to give a more ample notice of the work.

4. LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, delivered at the University of Virginia during the Session of 1850-1. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1852.

THE University of Virginia, established at the instance of Mr. Jefferson, has no professor of theology in its faculty; but a chaplain, taken successively from the four principal denominations of the state, is voluntarily employed by the professors and students to conduct public worship and give religious instruction in the institution; and he is allowed, it seems, to avail himself in a measure, if he chooses, of the aid of others in the sacred office. It was in such an arrangement that these lectures had their origin. Instead of proceeding exclusively from the pen of the chaplain for the time, they were, with one exception, delivered by ministers invited for the purpose from that and the neighboring states, and form a series on the principal proofs of the divine origin, inspiration, and truth of the sacred Scriptures; and they are highly creditable to the University. The discussion is—from the bold assaults that are now made on the word of God—most timely; the themes are well chosen, and, though differing greatly in their adaptation to an effective address, are, with one or two exceptions, decidedly well treated; and several of them display a high order of talent and cultivation.

As we have perused the volume, we have been impressed very strongly with the dependence of the whole discussion for its efficacy, on the further question, which is not debated in it; whether the media through which the revelations contained in the Scriptures are made are intelligible; or, in other words, whether there are means, and ample means, of determining with clearness and certainty what it is which God has employed them to communicate to us; and if so, what those means are; that is, what the principles are by which they are to be interpreted. Of what value can a communication be unless its import can be known? How, indeed, can a revelation be

.

said to be made unless the media through which it is conveyed are intelligible, and its meaning capable of being clearly ascertained ! But this great question—as several of the discussions in this number of the Journal show—is very far from being settled ; it is as much in debate as any of the themes that are here treated ; and views are held respecting it, and by persons in the sacred office, that, if followed to their legitimate results, are as subversive, we apprehend, of the teachings of the Bible as any of the rationalistic principles that are combated in this volume. There are not a few who earnestly deny that there are any clear and certain laws by which either the language or symbols through which the prophecies are conveyed are to be interpreted, and that make their meaning plain and indubitable ; and who claim the right, in a large part of their explanations, of arbitrarily assigning to the text a meaning that has no ground either in its terms or the objects of which it treats. We wish, therefore, that the plan of the lectures had embraced this theme, and the questions had been discussed : 1. Whether the established laws of speech by which the import of all other writings is determined, are to be implicitly followed in the interpretation of those parts of the sacred volume in which language is the medium of revelation ! 2. Whether the figures employed by the sacred writers are of specific and determinable natures, and are to be interpreted by fixed laws that are founded on those natures, and that render their meaning certain and demonstrable ; and if so, what those figures and their laws are ? 3. Whether the symbols are the media of the revelations made in symbolical prophecies, in contradistinction from the language in which they are described, and whether there are clear and demonstrable laws by which they are to be interpreted, and that render their meaning certain ; and if so, what those laws are ? 4. And, finally, what systems of interpretation prevail that are at variance with the laws of language and symbols, and that fatally misrepresent the import of the sacred word ? A just and thorough discussion of these topics, we believe, would excite a higher interest, meet a more urgent want, and render a more important service than any other that could be chosen from the whole circle of theology.

5. **MILLENNARIAN VIEWS**, with Reasons for receiving them. To which is added a Discourse on the Fact and Nature of the Resurrection. By Alfred Bryant, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Niles, Michigan. New York : M. W. Dodd. 1852.

THE frequent publication, of late, of works on the prophetic Scriptures may be taken as an index, in a measure, of the greater disposition

than heretofore that is now felt by numbers to read and inquire on the subject. Even the attacks that have been made on the doctrine of Christ's personal coming and reign, and attempts by misrepresentation to excite prejudice against it and its advocates, have had their origin in the perception that the counter views entertained by spiritualists are giving way under the light of investigation, and movements in progress, that, unless speedily arrested, must issue in a general rejection of their system.

We congratulate sincere inquirers after the truth on the appearance of this volume, which is excellently adapted to remove misconception, disarm prejudice, conciliate faith in the great purposes God has revealed, and inspire joy and gratitude at the infinite grandeur of the wisdom, and grace with which they are marked. Mr. Bryant justly states it, as the great distinguishing doctrine of millenarianism, that the world is at length to be fully redeemed from the dominion and curse of sin, and made the theatre of perfect righteousness, wisdom, love, and bliss through the endless round of ages—such as it would have been had the race never apostatized; and he demonstrates it by an array of passages and force of reasoning which, we think, the candid will not find it easy to resist. Is it not singular that such a doctrine, stamped as it is in the clearest characters on the pages of the prophets, so suitable to the divine perfections, and so congenial to the wishes of a benevolent heart, should not only be doubted and disbelieved by a crowd who profess to be ardently desirous of the conversion of the world; but rejected with absolute disgust, and assailed with a zeal and passion that are felt on no other subject?

The statement Mr. Bryant presents of the great doctrines of millenarianism, will, we presume, with the exception of his views of the personage seated on the cloud, Rev. xiv. 14, and the construction he favors of Rev. xx. 8–11, be assented to by millenarians generally. He treats the subject in a plain and practical manner, supports his views by ample proofs from the Scriptures, and presents in his candor and kindness an admirable contrast to the spirit with which recent anti-millenarian writers have been animated. We recommend it to those especially who have been misled by the misrepresentations of Dr. Spring, Mr. Rankin, Mr. Brown, and others of that class, or who are in danger of being misguided by Mr. Barnes. The work is worth thousands of such treatises, and unpretending as Mr. Bryant is, either as to genius or high scholarship, bespeaks much stronger sense, indicates a far profounder acquaintance with the teachings of the divine word, and exhibits immeasurably more just and comprehensive views of the great scheme of God's government.

6. **ROMANISM AT HOME.** Letters to Hon. R. B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States. By Kirwan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

THE object of this volume is to state the false doctrines, describe the superstitious and idolatrous rites, and depict the profligacy and tyranny of the priests, and degradation and misery of the people of the Catholic church at the present time in Italy. The picture, though sufficiently repulsive, has little of novelty. There are no original views, no fresh and startling thoughts suggested by the scenes beheld at Naples and Rome, no bold and graphic delineations that raise the theme above the dead level of common-places. The author takes only the most ordinary and material views of things. He treats the subject as though the question were in debate,—whether the Catholic is a proper religion for the people of this country, who owe the unexampled measure of prosperity and happiness which they enjoy to their Protestant faith, their general education, and their free and popular government; and the use he makes of the errors and enormities of the papal system which he details, is to demonstrate its unfitness for an intelligent and free people. That point, however, is not at all in discussion by the public. There are no tendencies as yet, in the population at large, to embrace the Catholic faith. Instead, the danger to be dreaded at present is a political one, resulting from the division of the population into two great parties, so nearly equal that the Catholics may have the power of determining who shall administer the government, and thereby be able to dictate in a measure the national policy. The accession of three or four millions more of emigrants, and the adoption of six or eight millions by the incorporation of Mexico, might not improbably give them strength sufficient to dictate laws unfavorable to Protestantism and religious freedom. Should such a crisis arrive, there will doubtless be politicians found who will be ready, for a momentary possession of power, to invest them with whatever prerogatives they may demand, and sacrifice for their gratification the liberties of the people and the interests of truth.

T H E

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY

J O U R N A L .

VOLUME V.

OCTOBER, 1852.

NUMBER II.

**ART. I.—THE SOURCES FROM WHICH THE MATERIALS OF
THE PRESENT CRUST OF THE EARTH WERE DERIVED.**

BY THE EDITOR.

THE great question in theoretical geology on which the conclusion in regard to the age of the world—founded on the structure of its rocky crust—depends, respects the sources from which the materials of the strata were derived. If they are held to have been such that immeasurable periods were required for their removal and deposition in their present form, then an existence of corresponding length is to be ascribed to the earth. If they are held and shown to have been such that but a brief period was necessary to their transference and arrangement in the positions in which they now lie, then there are no geological grounds for assigning it a longer existence than that which is ascribed to it by the Maker himself in the history he has given us in his word of its creation.

Whatever views, however, may be entertained on that subject, it will be admitted by all who regard the earth as the work of the allwise and almighty Creator, that they were specifically designed by him, and the causes and conditions

from which they sprang arranged for the purpose of giving them existence. They are not the offspring of chance. They are not the accidental work of causes that might not have acted, or that might have generated a wholly different product, without affecting the end for which they were created. The marks of intelligence and benevolence with which they are everywhere stamped, and the important office they fill in determining the condition of the race, forbid such a supposition. It is by them, in an eminent degree, that the world is fitted to be the residence of such an order of beings as men;—beings that are fallen, that are to be divided into different communities, and subsist under separate governments; that are capable of civilization, of arts, of commerce, and of great advances in knowledge; that are to gain the means of subsistence and comfort by toil and ingenuity; and that are to be placed in a great diversity of conditions, that they may in every possible form act out their natures, and show the moral dispositions with which they are animated towards God and one another. This constitution of the earth has, accordingly, exerted a most decisive influence on their physical, social, and moral condition. It is in a very large degree because its crust is what it is, in the proportion of the land and water; in the form and position of the continents and islands; in the direction and height of mountains; and in the nature and situation of rocks, soils, and minerals, that the life and career of the human family have been what they have; and that the condition of the several branches of which it consists is now what it is, in respect to knowledge, arts, government, and religion. A different arrangement of even a few of its features would have made it in important respects a different world; changed the relations to each other of large portions of its population, given a different direction to their pursuits, generated other empires, and issued in a different history. Had the Alps, for example, instead of separating Italy from France, divided France from Germany, it would have given a different cast to the whole history of ancient and modern Europe. Had the Himalaya, with their lofty table lands, in place of dividing Hindostan from Thibet, been interposed between Germany and Russia, the climate, the productions, and the population would have been essen-

tially changed, and the agency of the different tribes on one another, both in Europe and central Asia, been altogether unlike what they have been. Had Africa, instead of projecting from Europe to the south, stretched to the west, and joined this continent, it would have given a different turn, in a great degree, to the affairs of the whole world. America might then have been known, perhaps, to both Europe and Asia many ages ago; and been invaded by hostile armies from Africa, or Africa been conquered by the tribes of this western world. Europe and the Atlantic side of North America would then have been isolated from the southern part of the globe, and could have had no such commerce, and thence no such arts, and therefore no such eminence in wealth, cultivation, and power, as they now enjoy. Had South America extended to the Pole, and had the islands that lie southward from Malacca joined that peninsula, and rising into a continent stretched down to the region of perpetual ice, the three great southern oceans would have been isolated; there then could have been no circumnavigation of the globe, and consequently there could have been no general commerce.

The existence also of such strata as constitute the surface of continents and islands, and their upheaval and dislocation in their present form, have had an almost equal influence on the pursuits and character of the nations that occupy them. Had it not been for the metals that were imbedded in them, there could have been neither arts nor commerce. Had it not been, for example, for the tin, iron, lime, and coal that were deposited beneath the soil of Great Britain, she could neither have had such an agriculture, such manufactures, nor such a navigation. Had not the strata in which they and other important minerals are lodged, been elevated from their original position, broken into fragments, and exposed at the surface, they would have remained unknown, or from their inaccessibleness been without use; and she would have had but a barren soil and a scanty and uncultured population. It is thus by the provision of these means from which all the implements and enginery, and most of the materials of the arts are drawn, that man is armed with his power over the earth and sea, and made capable of appropriating them to his use, and rendering them

the instruments of subsistence, comfort, and progress in all the forms of cultivation.

It is apparent, therefore, from the momentous influence it was thus to exert, that the investiture of the earth with such a surface was expressly designed by the Creator, and held an important place in the great system of measures by which it was to be prepared to be the habitation of men. It was an indispensable condition to his placing them in such situations, and exercising over them such a providential administration as he has; and thence a necessary condition to their being subjected to such a discipline, made capable of such pursuits and acquisitions, and exerting such agencies as have constituted the great features of their physical, social, political, and in an important sense, also, their moral history. No part of the constitution of the world has drawn after it a more important train of consequences. No part of it bears more clear and emphatic proofs that it had its origin in the sovereignty, wisdom, and benevolence of its author, and held a conspicuous place in his great scheme, as the Ruler of the world. Whatever then the causes were of the formation of the strata, they are to be regarded as having been expressly assigned to that work, and armed with the requisite power for its accomplishment; and whatever the sources were from which the materials of the strata were drawn, they were arranged by him in their several places, with a direct reference to the agents by which they were to be transferred to their present positions, and the uses to which they are now appropriated. The means and conditions were fitted to the results that were to be attained, with the same intelligence and skill that mark the adaptation of other physical causes to the effects which God employs them to produce.

This great truth is to be borne in mind in our inquiries in respect to the agents and processes to which the strata owe their existence. Instead of having come into being aside from the great purposes of the Almighty, or sprung from causes whose proper office was to produce a different class of effects; they are the work of agents, and the result of conditions that were expressly appointed for their production, and that, on completing them, had accomplished their mission. They are themselves as absolute proofs of the existence and agency of such causes in such conditions, and

for that end, as the world itself is of the existence and agency of its cause. The fact that the agents by which they were produced, ceased to give birth to such effects, is a proof also that those agents are either no longer in existence, or at least no longer in activity in the circumstances that are requisite to the generation of such products. And the limitation of the effect to the point at which it terminates, was accordingly as much a matter of arrangement, as the agency was of the causes by which that effect was carried to that extent.

With these views, then, of the place which the present constitution of the globe holds in the great scheme of the divine administration, and the certainty that it is the result of causes and conditions that were expressly ordained to its production, let us inquire whence it was that the materials were derived that constitute the present surface of the earth, that has been formed since the creation of the globe itself.

Two theories have been entertained by geologists on this subject. The first is that which was advanced by Werner, who maintained that the whole rocky and earthy mass of the strata was originally held in solution by the waters of the ocean, and was gradually deposited by the agency of chemical and mechanical causes. But that is now universally rejected; as the waters of the ocean are wholly inadequate to the solution of such a quantity of matter; as there are no chemical forces by which such a mass and combination of elements could be at once held in solution in any volume of water however great; and no known laws of chemical agents by which such mixed substances held in solution could be separated and assorted in such a manner as to form strata differing in their composition like those of the crust of the earth. Instead of furnishing any explanation of the problem which it professes to solve, it embarrasses and confounds it by false assumptions and palpable contradictions to the laws of matter.

The other theory is that now generally held, which represents the materials of the strata as having been drawn from pre-existing continents and islands of granite, that were gradually disintegrated, borne down by streams to the sea, and spread by tides and currents over its bottom. But this, as was shown in our last number, is equally groundless and unphilosophical; as there are no proofs that such continents

and islands ever existed ; while it is certain from the elevation which is ascribed to them, and from the laws that govern the disintegration and transportation of such masses, that they cannot have been the source of the materials from which the strata were formed.

But if the materials of the earth were neither originally held in solution in the waters of the ocean, nor derived by disintegration from pre-existing continents and islands, it is manifest that, at least in the main, they must have been drawn from the interior of the globe. We shall, accordingly, endeavor to show that that was their origin ; and that it supersedes the necessity of assigning to the earth any earlier date than that which is ascribed to it by the history in Genesis of the creation and deluge.

In order to accomplish this, it is not necessary that we should demonstrate directly *from the strata themselves*, that they were thrown up from the depths of the earth, and arranged in their present form *within the period* that is implied in the Mosaic history of the world from its creation to the remodification of its surface at the deluge. All that it is requisite for us to prove is simply that it was compatible with the laws of nature, and therefore possible and probable ; as that being shown, the consistency of the facts of geology with the Scriptures is established. And that we shall accomplish by proving first that all the ingredients that enter into the composition of the different species of rocks and soils, originally existed in masses in the interior of the earth ; next, that vast volumes of them have been thrown up from the depths where they were first placed, and become parts of the present surface of the earth ; and, thirdly, that there have been agents in the proper conditions, and of sufficient force, to have ejected the whole body of the sedimentary strata, and within the period during which, according to the sacred narrative, they must have been formed. If these points are established, as the formation of the strata will be shown to have been practicable within the period that elapsed from the creation to the change of the earth's surface at the period of the deluge, no ground will exist in the strata themselves, for referring the creation of the world to an earlier date than that which is assigned it by the sacred history. This we shall, accordingly, now proceed to prove.

I. In the first place, then, there is the most ample certainty that all the various substances that enter into the composition of the present surface of the earth existed originally, and still exist within its depths. The chief of those substances are silica, alumine, lime, soda, potash, iron, magnesia. Of these, silica exists in far the greatest quantity; constituting, probably, at least one half of the whole mass of the rocks and soils. Its proportion in granite is usually about seventy-five per cent., to thirteen or fourteen of alumine, eight or nine of potash, nearly two of iron, a trace of lime, and one or two other ingredients. This rock is now universally regarded as having been thrown up from beneath the primary stratified deposits, and must have come, therefore, in a large measure from a depth in the earth, and demonstrates accordingly the existence in its interior of the several elements that enter into its composition. Felspar, mica, and hornblende, instead of simple minerals, are formed by the union of those elements in different proportions. In felspar there are of

Silica,	64.04	Potash,	13.66
Alumina,	18.94	Lime,	0.76
Oxide of iron,	0.74.		

In hornblende, the proportions are usually

Silica,	45.69	Magnesia,	18.79
Alumina,	12.18	Protoxide of iron,	7.32
Lime,	13.83	— of magnesia,	0.22
Fluoric acid,	1.50.*		

Several of these elements, however, enter in much larger proportions into the composition of lavas. Thus of the felspathic minerals in volcanic rocks, there are in

	Silica.	Alumine.	Lime.	Magnesia.	Soda.	Iron.	
Anorthite,	43.79	35.49	18.93				} and a trace of iron, magnesia, soda, and potash.
Labradorite,	53.48	26.46	9.49	1.74	4.10	1.60	and a trace of potash.
Andesin,	59.60	24.28	5.77	1.00	6.53	1.58	1.08 potash.
Albite,	69.36	19.26	0.46		10.50	0.43	— "
Orthoclase,	65.72	18.57	0.35		1.25	14.02	" "
Adularia,	65.69	17.97	1.34		1.01	13.99	" †

* H. T. de la Beche's Geol. Observer, pp. 34, 35.

† H. T. de la Beche's Geological Observer, p. 352. Daubney's Description of Volcanoes, p. 18.

In the volcanic rocks or lavas themselves these ingredients exist in still different proportions. Thus in Trachytes and other volcanic rocks, silica ranges from 49.21 to 78.46; alumina from 12.04 to 20.80; iron from 1.49 to 11.84; lime from 0.45 to 8.83; magnesia from 0.39 to 7.96; potash from 1.42 to 7.16; and soda from 4.29 to 7.98, with sometimes a trace of manganese.*

In the recent lava of Kilauea Hawaii, silica ranges from 39.74 to 59.80; protoxide of iron from 16.91 to 33.62; and soda from 4.83 to 21.62.†

In basalt, silica ranges from 44.50 to 59.5; alumina from 11.5 to 17.56; iron from 4.64 to 20.‡

In all these volcanic rocks, which it is universally held are ejected from deep abysses in the earth, all the great elementary substances of which the strata consist are thus conspicuous ingredients. They present the most decisive proofs, therefore, that the various substances that enter into the composition of the strata were placed by the Creator originally in masses in the interior of the earth.

But besides the place which lime holds in these volcanic rocks, it has in some instances been thrown up in masses from the interior of the planet. Thus Mr. Emmons describes many veins, dykes, and larger bodies in the northern section of this State that are undoubtedly of igneous origin.

"The origin of primitive limestone, I apprehend, is precisely the same as that of all the granitic compounds. It is not as some, perhaps, would be ready to suggest, produced by the overflowing of a molten mass of granite on a sedimentary limestone, thereby decomposing it; and by which portions the most intensely acted on would be raised in a vaporous state, and made to penetrate the mass of cooling granite above. Geologists, in speaking of limestone, seem to be averse to the admission that it may form *a portion of the interior of the earth*, or even to admit that it may exist there at all; but there seems not a particle of sound reason against the doctrine that it may be as common in the earth as silex, or any of the simple or compound rocks. There is, in fact, more reason to make this infer-

* De la Beche's Geol. Observer, p. 353.

† Dana's Geology of the U. S. Ex. Exped., p. 200.

‡ De la Beche's Geol. Observer, p. 396.

ence, for many of the phenomena of nature speak of its being, and proclaim its existence. From what I have seen of it, I am disposed to consider it as one of the igneous products, having its origin in a mode corresponding to all the unstratified rocks, and differing from them merely in the materials of which it is composed."—*Emmons's Geology of the 2d District of New York*, p. 26.

He accordingly cites a number of localities in which large masses, dykes, and veins of limestone project up from beneath into granite, in such a manner as to render it indisputable that they were forced from below in a state of fusion like the veins and dykes of granite, quartz, trap, and other species that have been driven up from beneath by heat into the primary and secondary formations.

Iron, also, has been ejected from the interior of the earth in masses, as is seen from its existence in rocks that are of igneous origin. Thus of the magnetic oxide Mr. Emmons states :

"Masses of ore appear to be coeval with the rock which incloses them ; or such a view comports best with many facts and phenomena which are brought to light in mining. If this is sustained by future investigations, it will necessarily follow that the original formation must have been influenced by the same agents as those which were concerned in the production or modification of the materials composing the rock. The rock which incloses the ore is clearly unstratified ; from which we are also to infer the igneous origin of the inclosed mass of ore. We are clearly driven off from every other mode of formation : the theory of electro-magnetic agency appears out of the question."—*Emmons's Geology of the 2d District of New York*, p. 90.

Other passages might be quoted from him and others, that present the same fact. We have thus the most indisputable proofs that all the great elements of the strata—silex, alumine, lime, potash, soda, magnesia, and iron—existed originally in the interior of the earth. The materials were lodged there on a vast scale, for the formation by their transference to the surface of precisely such composite rocks as those which now constitute the covering of the globe.

II. Immense masses of these substances that were originally deposited in the depths of the interior, have actually

been ejected to the surface, and now form a part of the earth's rocky vesture. Thus all the unstratified rocks—granite, porphyry, greenstone, serpentine, hypersthene, basalt, and all the varieties of trap, as well as the lavas and tuff of modern volcanoes, are universally admitted to be of igneous origin, and to have been elevated from the interior of the earth; and they together constitute a very considerable part of the crust that rises above the level of the sea. The Andes of South America, for example, extending from the Isthmus to Cape Horn, with a breadth of from 80 or 40 to 500 miles, cover, it is supposed, about one sixth of that continent, and rising from three or four thousand to fifteen or eighteen thousand feet, irrespective of the highest peaks, have undoubtedly—with the ranges that lie eastward of them in Venezuela, at the sources of the Orinoco, and in Brazil—several times the bulk of the other parts of the continent that lie above the line of the ocean; and they consist mainly of granite, porphyry, trachyte, andesite, basalt, and other igneous rocks, of which siliceous, alumine, lime, iron, potash, and soda, are the chief constituents. All these immense masses were thrown up to the surface, it should be considered, subsequently to the deposition of the principal stratified rocks; as is seen from the fact that they bear on their sides and summits vast bodies of the primary, secondary, and tertiary strata, that, anterior to their upheaval, were spread over the areas at the bottom of the sea they now occupy. Their elements existed in the depths of the earth, therefore, at the period of the formation of the strata, and constituted probably but a small portion of the immeasurable stores that were there treasured up. They prove, accordingly, that there was at that epoch an ample stock of them in the recesses of the earth for the formation of the strata. Nor have they been exhausted by the vast quantities that have been transferred to the surface. They continue to be thrown up by all the active volcanoes, and hold as large a place in the composition of their lavas, as in those that were ejected ages ago: and they continue still, there is every reason to suppose, to exist in exhaustless abundance in the interior of the globe. That a large share of the volcanoes from which they were once emitted, have sunk into inactivity, is owing to the exhaustion of the combustible or chemical agents in which

their fires had their origin; not to the want of silica, alumine, lime, soda, and potash, that were, it is to be presumed, the subjects on which their fires acted, rather than the direct cause itself of their combustion.

We have the most ample evidence, therefore, that sufficient stores of them were originally treasured up in the depths of the earth to furnish the materials of the sedimentary strata. There is enough of them there now—for aught that can be shown or rendered probable—to furnish a similar rocky covering to a score of such worlds as ours.

III. In the third place, there were chemical and mechanical agents in existence and activity at that period, of sufficient power to transfer those materials from the depths of the earth to the surface, and unite them in the forms in which they now subeist in the strata. That such agents have existed and acted in the deep abysses of the earth where those substances were deposited, and with far greater energy and on a far larger scale than was requisite to that effect, is seen from the fact that it was by their action that all the mountains of the globe, and in a great degree the whole mass of the continents and islands, were raised from beneath the ocean to their present elevation. And the masses thus moved that lie beneath the line of the sea, are probably hundreds of times greater than those that rise above that line. The base of the mountains or bottoms of the columns that were upheaved, lie probably many times the distance below the surface that their summits stretch above it. The force that was exerted in upheaving them was, therefore, immeasurably greater than was requisite to the elevation to the surface of the contents of any one of the strata that can be supposed to have been thrown up at a single effort. The whole mass of a mountain, however great in weight, was to be lifted at once. Of the materials of a stratum forced up in a continuous current, like the waters of a spring or the lava of a volcano, only a small portion was to be supported at the same time. The weight at any moment, for example, of the column of lava borne upwards in the cavity of Etna or Hecla, at a period of the most violent eruption, is but that of a feather to the mountain itself, compared to the vast and inconceivable weight that was uplifted at the elevation of the

Alps from the fathomless abysses of the earth in which their massy granites were elaborated. The lofty pinnacles and mounds of that range are themselves, indeed, but trifles, probably, in comparison of the vast bed extending down an immense depth in which they are rooted, that must have been elevated at the same moment along with them. Agents, then, have in fact been acting in the depths of the planet, and elevating the substances deposited there to the surface, that were of even greater energy than is ordinarily exerted in volcanoes, and than was necessary to the gradual ejection of the materials of the strata in the long series of ages that was occupied in their formation.

The forces, however, that are exerted in volcanic eruptions, and the volume of matter ejected by them on the surface in brief periods, is sometimes immense. Thus the current of lava thrown up in 1788 by Skáptar Jokul, one of the principal volcanoes of Iceland, was like that of a great river, and soon filled up deep valleys and spread over extensive plains.

“On the 11th of June, Skáptar Jokul threw out a torrent of lava which flowed down into the river Skapta and completely dried it up. The channel of the river was between high rocks, in many places from 400 to 600 feet in depth, and near 200 in breadth. Not only did the lava fill up this great defile to the brink, but it overflowed the adjacent fields to a considerable extent. The burning flood, on issuing from the rocky gorge, was then arrested for some time by a deep lake which formerly existed in the course of the river between Skaptardal and Aa, which it entirely filled. . . . On the 18th of June, another ejection of this liquid lava rushed from the volcano, which flowed down with amazing velocity over the surface of the first stream. By the damming up of the mouths of some of the tributaries of the Skapta, many villages were completely overflowed with water, and thus great destruction of property was caused. The lava, after flowing for several days, was precipitated down a tremendous cataract called Stapafoss, where it filled a profound abyss, which that great waterfall had been hollowing out for ages, and after this the fiery current again continued its course.

“On the 2d of August, fresh floods of lava still pouring from the volcano, a new branch was sent off in a new direction; for the channel of the Skapta was now so entirely choked up, and every opening to the west and north so obstructed, that the melted matter was

forced to take a new course, so that it ran in a south-east direction, and discharged itself into the bed of the river Haverfisfiot, where a scene of destruction scarcely inferior to the former was occasioned. These Icelandic lavas—like the ancient streams that are met with in Auvergne and other provinces of central France—are stated to have accumulated to a prodigious depth in narrow rocky gorges; but where they came to wide alluvial plains, they spread themselves out into broad burning lakes, sometimes from twelve to fifteen miles wide, and one hundred feet deep. When the fiery lake which filled up the lower portion of the valley of the Skapta had been augmented by new supplies, the lava flowed up the course of the river to the foot of the hills from whence the Skapta takes its rise. . . . The eruption did not entirely cease till the end of two years. . . .

“The extraordinary volume of the melted matter produced in this eruption, deserves the particular attention of the geologist. Of the two branches which flowed in nearly opposite directions, the greatest was fifty, and the lesser forty miles in length. The extreme breadth which the Skapta branch attained in the low countries, was from twelve to fifteen miles; that of the other about seven. The ordinary height of both currents was 100 feet, but in narrow defiles it sometimes amounted to 600.”—*Lyell's Principles*, vol. i. pp. 342–344.

The matter thrown out of this volcano principally in a few days of a single season, was thus enough probably to spread a stratum ten or twelve feet in thickness over six or seven thousand square miles.

The eruptions from Kilauea Hawaii are also on a vast scale:—

“The discharge from the large lake during the night of the 17th, must have been equal to fifteen million cubic feet of melted rock. This undoubtedly found cavities to receive it on the line of the eruption. It is impossible to calculate the discharge from the smaller or Judd's lake, but supposing it had continued as rapid as it was at the first filling, it would have thrown out, by the time I was there next day, upwards of two hundred million cubic feet of lava. It will readily be perceived, with such a flood, it would be possible within the lapse of a period comparatively short, geologically speaking, for a mound the size of Mauna Loa to be heaped up. However large the above numbers may seem to be, we have reason to suppose from appearances, that the ‘boiling up’ and overflow of the terminal crater of Mauna Loa must have been far greater; so much so, indeed,

that the outpourings of Kilauea cannot bear a comparison with it. Its whole height of more than six thousand feet above the plain of lava, appears to be entirely owing to the accumulation of ejected matter."—*Wilkes's Narrative of the U. S. Exploring Expedition*, vol. iv. p. 178.

In an eruption which commenced on the 30th of May, 1840, and continued three weeks, a far greater mass was ejected.

"The first appearance of the lavas at the surface occurred in a small crater about six miles from Kilauea. The next day another outbreak was distinguished farther towards the coast. Other openings followed, and by Monday, the 1st of June, the large flow had begun which formed a continuous stream to the sea, where it reached on the 3d of June, destroying the small village of Nanawale. This flood issued from several fissures along its whole course, instead of being an overflow of lavas from a single opening; the lowest being at an elevation of 1244 feet, as determined by Captain Wilkes, at a point twenty-seven miles distant from Kilauea, twenty-two miles from the first outbreak, and twelve from the shores. . .

"The lavas rolled on sometimes sluggishly and sometimes violently, receiving at times fresh force from new accessions to the fiery stream, and then almost ceasing its motion. It swept away forests in its course, at times parting and inclosing islets of earth and shrubbery, and at other times undermining and bearing away masses of rock and vegetation on its surface. Finally it plunged into the sea with loud detonations. The burning lava on meeting the waters was shivered, like melted glass, into millions of particles, which were thrown up in clouds that darkened the sky, and fell like a storm of hail over the surrounding country. Vast columns of steam and vapors rolled off before the wind, whirling in ceaseless agitation, and the reflected glare of the lavas formed a fiery firmament overhead. For three weeks this terrific river disgorged itself into the sea with little abatement. Night was converted into day on all eastern Hawaii. The light rose and spread like morning upon the mountains, and its glare was seen on the opposite side of the island. It was distinctly visible for more than one hundred miles at sea, and at the distance of forty miles fine print could be read at midnight. . . .

"From the period, thirty-six hours, which the lavas required to reach the sea, an average velocity of four hundred feet an hour is readily deduced, as stated by Captain Wilkes. Yet as the lavas issued from various fissures along the course, the result cannot be

correctly compared to an *overflow* of fluid; it is rather the rate of progress of the eruption than of the motion of a flowing liquid.

"The thickness of the stream of lava was estimated by Dr. Pickering as averaging ten or twelve feet. In some places it was not over six feet. The whole area, judging from the surveys, covers about fifteen square statute miles; and reducing to feet, and multiplying by the depth, 12 feet, gives, for the amount of ejected lava, 5,018,000,000 cubic feet; to which, if we add for the previous ejections of the same eruption, three more square miles, it gives 6,023,000,000 of cubic feet for the whole amount of lavas which reached the surface.*

"We have a still more accurate means of estimating the amount of lavas which passed from Kilauea, in the actual cubic contents of the emptied pit. The area of the lower pit, as determined by the surveys of the expedition, is equal to 38,500,000 square feet. Multiplying this by 400 feet, the depth of the pit after the eruption, we have 15,400,000,000 cubic feet for the solid contents of the space occupied by lavas before the eruption, and, therefore, the actual amount of the material which flowed from Kilauea. This is two and a half times the amount obtained from the estimated extent of the eruptions. The difference may be accounted for partly on the ground that fissures were filled as well as surfaces overflowed, and also that there may have been eruptions beneath the sea not estimated.† This amount is equivalent to a triangular ridge eight hun-

* This calculation, however, if we understand it, respects only the mass of the lava that remains on the surface between Kilauea and the shore. It takes no notice of the vast cataract that plunged into the ocean during the three weeks of the eruption. If that were taken into the account, the whole sum that was ejected would be seen to be immensely greater than this estimate.

† Here there is an omission also from the estimate of that portion of the lava that was precipitated into the sea. It is assumed also that no lava was ejected except what was drawn from Kilauea; and that no accessions were made to the stock in that reservoir during the progress of the eruption by fresh emissions from the abysses beneath; both of which were possible and probable, and on a great scale. The estimate must necessarily be in a large degree conjectural; but if conformed to the data furnished by Captain Wilkes, must greatly transcend Mr. Dana's calculation. Captain Wilkes represents the breadth of the stream at its entrance into the ocean as three fourths of a mile, or 3,960 feet: and the rush of the current to the sea as at the rate of 400 feet an hour. Let us suppose the breadth of the column precipitated into the sea to have been 3,500 feet, its average depth 10 feet, and the length of the current that made the plunge in twenty-four hours, 9,000 feet; the mass, at that rate, precipitated into the ocean in twenty days, would

dred feet high, two miles long, and over a mile wide at base."—*Dana's Geology of the U. S. Ex. Expedition*, pp. 188–192.

The materials of the strata, however, were not thrown up from the interior in the form of lava—as they exhibit no marks of fusion—but of mud or a liquid tide, much like that, probably, which is ejected by the mud volcanoes of Italy, South America, and the Crimea. It seems probable that the first volcanic ejections were neither in the form of molten lava, nor attended with flames or excessive heat. If materials like those of the granitic masses which now constitute the general floor on which the stratified and volcanic rocks rest, originally formed the exterior of the globe, as their crystallization has taken place since their creation, they may be supposed to have existed at first in the form of particles, and were not improbably at the surface promiscuously mingled with each other, so as to form on the first continents and islands, a proper soil for the plants which were made to spring from them. As all the rocks, indeed, of which we have any knowledge, whether crystalline or stratified, have been formed since the creation of the elements of which they consist, we may justly assume that the surface of the earth to the depth which they now occupy, whatever that may be, was in its primitive state, in the form of dust, or without cementation in hard masses. If such was its state, the water of the ocean would naturally have descended into it, and as long as it met with no other substances than those that constitute granite, as it would have excited little more chemical action than sea water now does on pulverized granite, its chief effect would have been simply to moisten and soften the mass, and render it susceptible of a more easy displacement when subjected to the impulse of a powerful force from beneath. On the supposition then that the water descended to a depth equal to that of the present volcanic fires, which is, probably, at least fifteen or twenty miles below the surface, ere it came in contact with elements like iron, for

be 6,800,000,000 cubic feet; to which, if the mass remaining on the surface, as estimated by Mr. Dana, 5,018,000,000, be added, they will form an aggregate of 11,818,000,000 cubic feet. If to these the proportion he supposes to have been absorbed by measures be added, the whole sum will be near 20,000,000,000.

example, and sulphur, which it could excite to powerful chemical action, and that it was then decomposed, a violent heat developed, and vast volumes of expansive gases generated; the effect would have been an upheaval of the softened mass at the points where that action became energetic, and at length the opening of a passage to the surface, by chasms extending, perhaps, long distances, through which the imprisoned forces beneath would have found vents; and the main discharges from which, at first, would obviously have been not molten lava, nor mud raised to a great heat, but the softened earth itself nearest the surface, and subsequently from greater depths. All the force of a powerful volcano may thus be supposed to have been employed for a long time in the seasons of its activity, in the propulsion to the surface of such unfused materials as form the great elements of the strata, ere burning lava began to be ejected; and this supposition is corroborated by the fact, that it was not till the primary and secondary strata had been formed that the igneous rocks began to appear on the surface.

Another important effect of such a process would have been, that that portion of the earth's surface which was expanded upwards beneath the ocean, would have been exposed by its elevation to the violent action of waves and tides, and currents, and swept off and spread, like that ejected from the depths below, over the surrounding surface. On the intermission of such an eruption, the chasm would speedily have been obliterated by the action of the waters on the softened mass, and soon, perhaps, no other indications of it remained, than the greater thickness near it of the stratum it had formed, than at a distance; as strata usually thin out regularly from the point or line where they attain their greatest depth.

Views very similar to these were several years since suggested by Mr. Bakewell, an eminent English geologist, for the purpose especially of accounting for the limestone and chalk formations. Thus, he says:

"In referring to the vast magnitude of ancient volcanoes, I have stated that they had, doubtless, an important office to perform in nature; and can it be unreasonable to believe that *the earth itself is the great storehouse where the materials that form its surface were*

prepared, and from whence they were thrown out upon the surface in an igneous, aqueous, or gaseous state, either as melted lava, or in aqueous solution, or in mechanical admixture with water in the form of mud, or in the comminuted state of powder or sand? Inflammable and more volatile substances may have been emitted in a gaseous state, and become concrete on the surface.

"These primæval eruptions, judging from the size of the ancient fissures and craters, may have been sufficient to cover a large portion of the globe. Nor can it be deemed improbable that still larger and more ancient craters have been entirely covered by succeeding eruptions. In proportion as the formation of the surface advanced, these eruptions might decline and be more and more limited in their operation.

"It is not necessary to suppose that these subterranean eruptions consisted only of lava in a state of fusion. The largest active volcanoes at present existing, throw out the different earths intermixed with water in the form of mud. Nor should we limit the eruptions of earthy matter in solution or suspension to volcanic craters; the vast fissures or rents which intersect the different rocks, may have served for the passage of siliceous solutions to the surface. We know of no instance in nature of siliceous earth being held in aqueous solution, except in the waters of hot or boiling springs; and hence it seems reasonable to infer that many siliceous rocks and veins have been deposited from subterranean craters at a high temperature. Calcareous or cretaceous matter is also ejected during aqueous volcanic eruptions. According to Ferrara, streams of liquid chalk, or chalk in the state of mud, were ejected from the mud volcano of Macaluba, in Sicily, in 1777, which in a short space formed a bed several feet in thickness. Beds of limestone may have been formed by similar calcareous eruptions, in which the lime might be sometimes in solution, and sometimes mechanically suspended; and the numerous remains of testaceous animals in limestone appear to indicate that the calcareous solutions were favorable to the growth of animals whose coverings contain so much calcareous matter. Nor is it necessary to suppose that these aqueous eruptions were always sudden, and attended with violent convulsions, for when a passage was once opened they may have risen slowly, and have been diffused in a tranquil state, and by gradual deposition or condensation, may have enveloped the most delicate animals or vegetables without injuring their external form.

"If the geologist can admit such a condition of the ancient world as above described—a condition which on a smaller scale might be proved to have existed since the period of authentic history; if he

will further admit, that before the formation of chalk, a great portion of what is now England and the northern continent of Europe, was covered by a deep ocean, interspersed with islands and surrounded by ancient continents—and this few modern geologists will deny—then if we allow submarine aqueous eruptions of calcareous matter either in solution or mechanical suspension, and eruptions of siliceous solutions from thermal waters, to have been poured over the bottom of this deep and ancient ocean, we shall have all the circumstances required to form thick beds of chalk, interspersed with layers and nodules of flint. . . .

“My object in directing the attention of geologists to this subject, is to show that *strata may be formed more rapidly* than they are generally disposed to believe; and that the feeble operations of natural causes in our own times, however similar in kind, bear no proportion in their intensity to the mighty agents that have formed the ancient crust of the globe.”—*Bakewell's Geology*, pp. 351–355.

A similar suggestion in respect to the origin of limestone was made by Mr. Featherstonhaugh, in his report in 1835.

“The general deposits of calcareous matter on the globe have been by some persons attributed to the exuvise of animals, without stopping to inquire whence those animals derived the solid parts they have left behind them. As we know not that animals have the power of forming lime from other mineral elements, we are compelled to suppose that the calcareous matter forming their osseous structure, their testaceous and crustaceous coverings, preceded them. In considering the primitive rocks, we have perceived that forces of great power, and unknown in modern times, have been in action in the earlier periods of the planet—forces which even now continue occasionally to act, though feebly and rarely. As to the manner in which the statuary limestones were produced, there is much ambiguity. We know, however, that mineral springs, both thermal and cold, deposit carbonate of lime in great quantities, as they come in contact with the atmosphere. The prodigious deposits of this character form a cold mineral water in the Sweet Springs valley in Virginia, which presents one of the most rare geological phenomena; the no less interesting travertine deposited by the Hot Springs of the Washita in Arkansas, both of which localities I visited this last year, and similar phenomena in various parts of the world, render it quite possible that some extraneous calcareous deposits, lying amidst the primitive rocks, have come from the central parts of the earth in a state of aqueous solution, and have subsequently received their high

crystalline character from being in contact with ignigenous rocks in an incandescent state. With springs of such a character in action, the animals of those times could be at no loss for calcareous matter in favored localities.

“In the grauwaacke we have beds of limestone, derived, for aught we know to the contrary, like the statuary limestone in the primitive series, from solutions ejected from below, alternating with schistose and sandy beds of probable mechanical origin.”—*Featherstonhaugh's Report, 1835, on the country between the Missouri and Red Rivers*, pp. 20-25.

Such as we have already shown, is the theory in respect to the origin of limestone advanced by Dr. Emmons. We cite from him another passage.

“The opinions of geologists in relation to the origin of limestone have been hitherto unsettled. From the great amount of limestone in the strata which may be inspected, it has been supposed that animals possessed the power of forming it, or of combining its elements. This view or theory seems to be wholly unnecessary; for what reason have we to infer that it is a material less common in the interior of the earth than siliceous or aluminous? And if it is common, it may find its way to the surface by the same means as the materials composing other rocks.

“Leaving here the opinions of other geologists, I will state that there are two points which it will be my object to establish: 1st, That it is a rock of igneous origin; and 2d, That it is unstratified, which follows from the establishment of the first point: or, if the last proposition is placed first—viz. that the rock is unstratified, its igneous origin seems to follow with equal certainty; so that the points to be proved are really reduced to one.”—*Emmons's Geology of the Second District of New York*, p. 38.

He proceeds, accordingly, to establish these points by proofs drawn from the rock in a great number of localities.

Mr. Hall adopts the same theory to account for the formation of some of the sandstones of the western district of this State.

“If we might be permitted to hazard a conjecture as to the changes and their causes going on at the time of the deposition of these different divisions of the Medina sandstone—we should incline to the belief that the lower shaly deposit was the product of a mud

volcano, rapidly ejected and spread over the surface, rendering the sea turbid and discolored to such a degree as to prevent the existence of any organic forms. Afterwards the cessation of the volcanic action allowed the deposition of the grey quartzose mass; the materials having perhaps the same origin as the grey sandstone which was formed previous to the commencement of the Medina. Although at this period there was no matter ejected from the volcano, still it may have produced oscillations of the surface, causing alternate deep and shallow water, or deep water in some places and shallow in others. Subsequently towards the close of the grey deposit, the volcano broke forth again with renewed energy, destroying all the organic forms which had come into existence during this comparatively quiescent period, and overwhelming the whole with another deposit of mud like that below. Again, after a time the subterranean action appears to have become more quiet, gradually subsiding, and allowing an increase of sandy matter from some other source. Lastly, towards the termination of the deposit of mud, and when the sand had increased considerably, we find an abundance of vegetable forms, . . . and the whole series terminating with the grey division, marked by that singular fossil, the *Dictuolites*."—*J. Hall's Geology of Western New York*, p. 40.

We have the most decisive evidences, therefore, that the great agents that have acted in the depths of the earth where the substances of which the strata consist were originally deposited, were abundantly adequate to transfer them to the surface in the state that was requisite to their conversion into the rocks into which they were formed.

IV. These agents were adequate to the transference of the materials of the strata from the interior to the surface, in the period that is represented in the Mosaic record as having intervened betwixt the creation of the earth and the remodification of its surface at the flood. Sixteen hundred, eighteen hundred, or two thousand years were as ample for the work as sixteen or eighteen thousand, or the immeasurable round of ages which geologists represent as having been occupied in the derivation of the materials of the strata from granitic mountains and continents that were to be disintegrated and transported to the ocean by the feeble agents that are now reducing the rocks to dust, and conveying their detritus to the sea. That the materials for such a process

were deposited in the depths of the earth throughout its whole circuit, is seen from the fact, that the whole mass of the granite which is now elevated into the atmosphere, and which lies beneath the stratified formations, has, in the judgment generally of geologists, been raised to fusion by heat from beneath, and received its present crystalline form since the deposition of the primary strata. There is no reason to suppose that a particle of that rock was brought into existence in its present state by the creative fiat. It is the work of powerful chemical and mechanical forces that have since acted on the siliceous, aluminous, potash, soda, lime, iron, magnesia, and other ingredients of which it is constructed. But if that took place in the manner we have supposed, by the evolution of heat in the depths of the earth, the first effect of which was the propulsion to the surface of vast masses of siliceous, aluminous, lime, potash, soda, magnesia, iron, and other elements that enter into the composition of the strata, in the form of minute particles, moistened or rendered liquid by water, then, manifestly, the causes of the propulsion of these materials to the exterior existed beneath every point of the surface, and were as universal as the strata themselves are that have been formed from them. They were undoubtedly, therefore, at least as adequate to the production of the latter effect as they were of the former. Indeed, if the views we have presented of the process are correct, the fusion of the granitic elements, which originally lay at the surface, could not have been produced by the evolution of heat in the abysses beneath, without first producing chasms and vents at innumerable points, and forcing up into the superincumbent ocean immense volumes of the moistened materials that lay between the surface and the great subterranean laboratory from which the heat and the explosive forces generated by it proceeded.

Let us suppose the waters of Lake Superior to be drained, and its bed scooped down through the whole series of stratified and crystallized rocks that lie beneath it, till a region were reached at a depth perhaps of fifteen or twenty miles, where, let it be assumed, a vast magazine is treasured up of volcanic materials. Let us then suppose the chasm to be filled by successive layers, each hundreds or thousands of feet in thickness, of siliceous, aluminous, lime, potash, soda, iron,

magnesia, and a proportionate share of the other elements that enter into the composition of the strata, in minute primitive particles. Let us suppose the waters of the lake then to be readmitted to its bed, and gradually to descend through it till they reached the magazine of volcanic matter, and generated an expansive force by which the superincumbent mass should be pushed upwards; it is manifest that that portion of the upper layer, at the points where the impulse from below was the greatest, would be the first that would be raised above the general level and mixed with the waters of the lake; and that if it were silex, it would, on being subjected to the proper agencies, form quartz rock or sandstone; if alumine, with an intermixture of silex, it would form marl, or some species of schist; and if lime, limestone. The effect of the impelling force from beneath, however, especially if large volumes of gas were driven upwards, would soon be to open a passage to the surface by a vein or chasm, through which a current of the moistened or liquid matter would be driven up into the waters of the lake, and diffused over its bottom; and if that process were continued, a portion of each layer in the series would be raised to the surface and spread in a stratum over the bed of the lake—before a stream of melted lava would mount through the passage and pass into the waters, or shoot into the atmosphere. But such a stupendous enginery acting, with slight intervals, at innumerable points throughout the circuit of the globe, would have been amply adequate to throw the whole materials of the strata on the surface in the lapse of fifteen, sixteen, or eighteen hundred years. Such a period would, indeed, seem excessive rather than too short for such a work. Such powerful agents, acting at points not more numerous than those at which igneous rocks and lavas have been driven to the surface, would undoubtedly have been sufficient for that effect.

We have thus the most ample evidence of the existence at that period of the requisite materials and agents in the proper conditions for the accomplishment of that work. We shall now proceed to show that this view of the origin of the strata is corroborated and verified by a variety of considerations.

1. It is confirmed by the great number of the points at

which igneous rocks and lavas have been forced up to the surface. The number of volcanoes that burned during the formation of the secondary and tertiary strata was not only far greater than at present, but in the ratio probably of hundreds to one. Their traces are seen on a vast scale in many regions where no eruptions have taken place for centuries. Thus they are very numerous in Central and Southern France, sixty cones being distinguishable in the single province of Auvergne. They exist in great numbers in Germany, Hungary, Transylvania, and Styria. In Northern, Central, and Southern Italy they are very frequent; in Sicily, also, Sardinia, and the neighboring islands. Traces of them are seen in Spain and Portugal. Their relics exist on a great scale in the islands of the Grecian Archipelago, and throughout Asia Minor. They are seen also in Syria, Southern Arabia, Persia, Northern and Eastern Asia, and the islands of the Chinese seas. Most of the islands of the Atlantic, and—except those of coral—nearly the whole of the vast crowd that stud the Indian and Pacific oceans, have been the seat of volcanoes; and craters that no longer burn are found in great numbers along the whole line of the mountains that skirt the Pacific coast, from the Arctic Ocean to Cape Horn. If the number still active in different parts of the globe is, as is supposed, from one hundred and seventy-five to two hundred, the whole series that have burned at successive periods must undoubtedly amount to many thousands.

But the number of points at which igneous rocks—granite, porphyry, basalt, and trap—have been forced up to the surface, is immensely greater. Some, or all of them, are found in almost every considerable district of the globe. Though there are no traces in the British islands of modern volcanoes, granite, porphyry, greenstone, hypersthene, basalt, and trap form the crust, or lie immediately beneath the soil in England, Scotland, Ireland, and the Hebrides and Orkneys, in thousands of places, indicating that there has been at least an equal number of passages from the molten abyss beneath, through which first the materials that lay above it, and then a portion of its own contents, have been driven up to the surface. In this country no lavas occur throughout the wide space betwixt the

Mississippi and New Brunswick, or the great lakes and the Atlantic; yet granite, porphyry, hypersthene, hornblende, greenstone, serpentine, basalt, and trap, rise to the surface, or tower into the atmosphere in myriads and perhaps hundreds of thousands of places, so distinct from each other as to show that the passages through which they generally made their way to the surface, were separate from each other. They are equally numerous also on other portions of the globe. Half as many channels of ejection from below, and probably a much smaller number, would have been adequate for the transfer to the surface, in a very few centuries, of a sufficient mass of materials for the formation of the strata. That such a vast number of openings have been formed from the interior, through which immense volumes of matter have been thrown up and incorporated in the crust of the globe, demonstrates, at least, the possibility and probability that it was through them or others of the like nature that the silix, alumine, lime, soda, iron, potash, and other elements of which the strata are built, were forced up into the oceans and seas from which they were deposited.

2. It is corroborated by the deposition of the great elements—silix, alumine, and lime—of which the strata consist, in separate layers, instead of a promiscuous mixture;—silix constituting sandstone chiefly; lime forming limestone and chalk; and alumine, potash, and soda, which are conspicuous ingredients of felspar, going, in a large measure, into the composition of shales, clays, and marls. That the ingredients of the strata are treasured up in the masses separately from each other in the depths of the earth, is demonstrated, as we have already shown, by their being often separately ejected and embodied in the igneous rocks. Their distribution into separate strata is explicable, therefore, on the supposition that they were drawn from such depositories, and not on any other theory of their origin. Had they been formed, as geologists generally maintain, from the detritus of granitic mountains and continents that was transported by rivers to the sea, instead of being separated from each other and arranged in distinct layers, they would have been deposited in a confused mass together. But if ejected successively from different depositories in the recesses of the earth, they would naturally continue separate, in a great

degree, on their transfusion into the waters of the sea, and be deposited in beds by themselves. They would receive that disposition, whether they were drawn from repositories placed in a series beneath each other, like that in which they are arranged in the strata, and thence had egress in succession at the same channel, or whether each one, descending in a column into the depths of the earth, was thrown up through a passage that was limited to itself. Either of these hypotheses furnishes a solution also of the partial intermixture of the strata sometimes seen at their juncture, or the passage of one into another, of which the common theory presents no explanation. The ejection of their elements through the same or different passages, in immediate succession, would naturally cause a mixture of those of their particles that were held in suspension in the waters of the ocean at the same time, or in close succession to each other. That this view of their origin thus naturally accounts for these conspicuous characteristics of the strata, that are inexplicable on any other theory, is a strong proof of its truth.

8. It is confirmed by the solution it furnishes of the diffusion of the strata over wide spaces. On the theory held by geologists, the spread of a stratum of gneiss, quartz, sandstone, arenaceous limestone, or any other similar deposit over a large area, is wholly inexplicable. It is inconsistent with the forces that govern the transportation and deposition of pebbles, gravel, and sand in water, that, being borne down to the sea by streams and rivers, they should be transfused through its mass and deposited equally over hundreds, and even thousands of square miles. As the currents by which they are supposed to be borne forward are checked by the resistance they meet on entering the ocean, gravel and sand of every description are immediately carried by their weight to the bottom, and are no more subject afterwards to be transferred to other places than any other parts of the shore or bed of the sea. That the waves, currents, and tides should remove them and spread them into strata over regions scores and hundreds of miles in length and breadth, is physically impossible. If, however, the materials of the strata were thrown up from the depths of the earth into the waters of the ocean in the form of the primitive minute particles in which Newton and other philoso-

phers regard matter as originally created, their diffusion over wide spaces would naturally result from their lightness and mobility under the action of the tides, currents, and waves of the sea. Driven up into the mass of the waters by the impulse that forced them from below, they would be borne off by the current the stream in which they entered created, and continue for a period to float, like the impalpable particles that are held in solution or suspension by the Mississippi, Ganges, and other great rivers; and when thrown to the bottom, would form at first a liquid mud that would, by its own gravity, spread on every side and seek a level, as water at the surface, though partially thickened with light mud, flows in every direction till it finds a level. Silix or lime forced up in that form through numerous channels, widely distributed, into the ocean that spread from Vermont to the Rocky Mountains, would naturally have been diffused, by the forces to which it would have been subjected, over as large an area as is occupied by any of the sandstones or limestones of that region; and the layers in which it would at length have been deposited, would naturally have thinned out also from the centres from which they were spread, so as to vary at different points in thickness, as the sandstones, limestones, and shales of that region vary.

The union of their particles in granules and grains took place probably at their deposition. The causes that determined them to assume those forms are not known. That they were peculiar, however, to that era, is seen from the fact that grains of silix and felspar are no longer formed where those substances are deposited from water. The supposition that they assumed the shapes in which they now exist in the strata, at the time of their deposition, or cementation into solid rock, is as compatible, for aught that is known, with the laws of their formation, as the supposition that their concretion into grains took place at an earlier period.

4. These views are confirmed by the explanations they furnish of the elevations and subsidences of portions of the crust of the globe, which appear to have taken place during the formation of the strata, and that occasionally occur still.

Had the earth been, as is very generally maintained by

geologists, in a state of "fusion from intense heat" when it began to be overspread with its solid crust; and if, as they hold, its interior (with the exception of a stratum of a few miles' thickness on its surface) has continued in that condition, no such elevation or depression of parts of its rocky covering could have taken place; nor could there have been an ejection of any of its liquid elements to the surface by volcanic forces. In order to an elevation of any portion of its solid crust, or propulsion of a part of its interior matter to the surface, a fresh evolution of heat and generation of gases, creating a pressure outward, would be necessary. But such a molten condition of the interior would preclude the possibility of either of those processes. A fresh evolution of heat and generation of expansive gases could only take place by a fresh and powerful action on each other of chemical substances and agents, by which portions of their elements would assume new forms, enter into new combinations, and release, in the process, vast volumes of heat that had before remained latent. But in such an ocean of molten lava no substances or agents of that nature would exist. Every particle of its matter being—by the supposition—already in intense fusion, it would have reached the maximum of the chemical agency in that form of which it was capable, and given out all the latent heat and discharged all the gases which it could yield. The chemical action accordingly of its several parts on each other having terminated, they would have sunk into repose and been incapable of any further change by virtue of their own powers, than a gradual loss of their caloric by conduction through their rocky envelope to the ocean and atmosphere without. An elevation of any part of the crust of the globe, or a propulsion of lava to the surface by the agency of such a molten ocean, would consequently be impossible. How could forces of such vast energy as would be requisite to lift a portion of the earth's crust, thirty, forty, or fifty miles in thickness, and extending through several degrees in length and breadth, be generated by a chemical agency, when there were no chemical substances or agents within the globe capable of acting on each other in such a manner as to develope an additional measure of heat, and expand the matter of which they consisted into larger dimensions? How could passages be

forced outward to the surface, and immense volumes of gas and melted matter be driven with resistless violence to the surface, when the mass within was necessarily in a state of absolute repose, and no elements existed in it that were capable of yielding a fresh expansive force? A volcano ejecting a fiery flood from such a world would be as impossible as it would from a vacuum.

That theory, therefore, not only furnishes no solution of the elevations and depressions to which the crust of the earth has been subjected; but it exhibits those and all other processes of the kind as impossible. No volcanoes could have existed, no earthquakes could have taken place, no elevation of mountains, no dislocation of the strata could have been wrought by the action of forces from within had its constitution and conditions been what that hypothesis represents. That none of the great number of practical and speculative geologists and chemists who have advocated that view have caught a glimpse of consequences that would result with such certainty from the condition of the earth which they suppose, and the laws of chemical action, is truly surprising. They appear to have adopted the theory without looking at the implications which it involves.

On the view, however, of the earth's structure which we have advanced, all the phenomena of earthquakes and volcanoes, and the upheaval, depression, and dislocation of the surface, are naturally explainable. If vast masses of chemical substances were placed in separate repositories in the depths of the earth, that were susceptible, on being acted on by water, electricity, or other agents, of giving out immense measures of heat, generating vast volumes of gas, and exciting a combustion, by which the matter with which they were in contact would be raised to intense fusion, the expansion their action on a large scale would create, would, of necessity, either upheave the crust of the globe that rested on them, or force a passage through that crust, and relieve itself by an expulsion of the imprisoned matter till an equilibrium were restored. If the materials by which that heat and combustion were excited, were at length exhausted, and the temperature subsided to its original point, a space would then be left vacant in the interior commensurate with that which was originally occupied by the

volume of matter that had been ejected to the surface; and if that space, instead of a great depth, were spread like a stratum over a wide level, the weight of the incumbent mass might, from the distance of the points on which it rested, force it to descend and fill up the vacuum. An elevation, a depression, and a dislocation of the surface, would thus naturally result from such an action of those causes; and there is no other view on which an upheaval or depression of a part of the earth's crust can be accounted for. As an upheaval and expulsion of matter to the surface could only result from a fresh evolution of heat producing an expansion of the substances on which it acted; so a subsidence could only result from a diminution or discontinuance of that expansion, by a diminution or cessation of the evolution of heat, in consequence of which, the upward pressure ceasing, a vacancy would be created, and the superincumbent crust, deprived in a measure of its support, would sink under the force of gravity till it met a firm basis. How could an area of the surface sink down a distance towards the centre unless the space into which it descended had become vacant? If the support that had always upheld it remained unaltered, to what cause could it owe its depression? But how could a cavity of dimensions adequate for such a movement be produced in the depths of the earth, except by a transference of the materials, that originally occupied it, to the surface? And how could they be transferred to the exterior, except by an expansion of the matter that lay beneath or behind them, and occupation of the space from which they were expelled? How, on the other hand, could that expansion cease, and the matter that had last filled the recess it had created, subside into its original dimensions, except by a discontinuance of the chemical action of which that expansion was the effect? And what could occasion such a discontinuance, except an exhaustion of the chemical substances in which that action and the evolution of heat it had caused, had their origin? There are no other known causes and processes from which those results could spring. As then, wherever a subsidence has taken place, the vacancy into which the depressed crust descended must have been created by the expulsion to the surface of the substances that had originally occupied it, wherever those ejected sub-

stances were not, in some measure at least, in the form of lava, they must—so far as they were not purely gaseous—have been unfused, and consisted, therefore, either of dry or moistened particles, or been held in suspension or solution in water. But there are many localities in which elevations and subsidences appear to have taken place where no traces are seen of lava, or any species of igneous rock. The substances, therefore, which at those localities have been thrown up to the surface from the space into which the subsid-ing crust descended, *must have been unfused, and entered, in the manner we have supposed, into the composition of the strata.* In what other form can they have been ejected? or what other disposition can have been made of them? No unfused silix, alumine, lime, magnesia, soda, or potash, are found on the surface, except that which is incorporated in the sedimentary strata and the loose soils that rest on them.

This view of the causes of the elevation and depression of the earth's crust admits of their occurrence as often during the formation of the strata as appearances indicate that they have taken place, and suggests the reason that subsidences have been followed by upheavals, as well as upheavals by subsidences. If the chemical and combustible elements in which a volcano has its origin are distributed in layers so varying in breadth and thickness that the quantity exposed to the action of the fire is at some times far greater than at others, or the layers or masses in which they are arranged are separated by barriers that for a time intercept the progress of combustion, variations will naturally occur, like those which actually take place in its activity, and transitions at times from violent ebullition to repose and apparent extinction, and from repose to sudden and violent eruption. It would give rise also to such alternate elevations and depressions as portions of the earth's crust appear to have undergone. An exhaustion of the materials to which the fire had access, would be followed by a season of inaction, a discontinuance of the upward pressure, and thence a descent of the mass above, from the loss of its support, into the vacant recess; but the fires reaching a new depository of combustibles, perhaps by a slight train, perhaps by the shock of an earthquake breaking down barriers, or opening fresh chasms, it would burst

out afresh, rage with its primitive violence, and produce a new upheaval of the crust that lay between it and the atmosphere. But how could such alternations of activity and repose take place if the whole interior of the globe were maintained uniformly at the same point of intense fusion? How could a second upheaval occur, if, instead of an occasional augmentation, a perpetual diminution of heat took place—as must, were the common theory true—by conduction to the ocean or air through the surrounding strata?

That these and other kindred processes to which the earth has been subjected, which are wholly inexplicable on the theory generally held by geologists, thus admit of a satisfactory explanation on the view we have advanced of the earth's structure and the derivation of the strata, is a decisive proof that that view is correct.

5. This view of the origin of the materials of the strata, and the consequent subsidence of the crust of the earth into the vacuum their removal had created, suggests an explanation of the accumulation of the vast mass of tree-ferns and other vegetables in the localities where they have been converted into coal. That the materials from which the coal was formed did not in the main grow where the coal lies, is apparent from the immense bulk that was required for beds that are of any considerable thickness; and from the fact that that of which the bottom of the strata was formed, exhibits no more marks of having undergone decomposition or decay than that which lay at the top. The traces of stems, branches, and leaves, are as distinct and perfect in the lower divisions of the strata, as at the centre or surface. The whole, therefore, of which a layer was constituted, must have been deposited at once. How then were they conveyed thither? How, for example, was the immeasurable mass of which the principal stratum was formed extending from the Delaware to the Mississippi, and from the Appalachians nearly to the lakes, and of a depth in many places of ten, twelve, or fourteen feet, conveyed to that area? Not by rivers. All the vegetable matter that was ever borne on the streams of the continent, multiplied thousands and millions of times, would be inadequate to constitute such an immense bed. All the trees and plants that grow in the line of the rivers of a continent, in such positions as to expose them to

be uprooted and borne off by floods, is but an inappreciable fraction compared to the whole that springs from the vales, plains, and mountains; and would never in the lapse of ages amount to enough could they be concentrated at one point, to form a coal bed of any considerable thickness and extent. But that those of which the strata were formed were not transported to the places of their deposition by the agency of rivers, is apparent from the absence from the coal of all earthy sediment. Had rivers at periods of flood been the agents of their transportation, they would have been intermixed, like the trees that are carried by the Mississippi to its mouth, with a mass of mud, that would have precluded their conversion into a stratum of pure coal. The only force that could have swept them together in such an immeasurable mass unmixed with other matter, was that of the ocean rushing over a vast tract of fern-forests, and other vegetables, that was rapidly sinking beneath it. And that might have accomplished it. Let us suppose, for example, that immediately antecedent to the deposition of the principal stratum of the great bed of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana, the continent eastward to the Atlantic, and westward to the Rocky Mountains, stood above the ocean and was covered with a rich vegetable growth. As none of the mountains that now stretch across it had then risen above the surface, had it suddenly sunk a half mile or mile beneath the line of the sea, the waters rushing over it with resistless force would have uprooted or wrenched off every tree and vegetable of any considerable size; and bearing them forward in a confused mass, accumulated them chiefly on the line where the waters of the two oceans met. If the subsidence began so much earlier on the Pacific than the Atlantic side, that their waves met or finally sank to repose on the line of that coal bed, the relics with which they were charged would have centred there. As they would naturally have been much entangled, that part which lay lowest would, on being saturated with water by the pressure to which it was subjected, have become so heavy as to have sunk, and dragged down such as was bound with it; the next tier would soon have followed, and the whole at length have reached the bottom, where its own weight, increased by the water with which its cells would have become filled, and the

vast pressure of the ocean, would speedily have reduced it to a solid mass. Such processes are certainly adequate to the production of such effects, and they are processes which all geologists admit have indisputably taken place. Why then should not the solution which they furnish of the accumulation of the materials of the coal strata, which is inexplicable on the prevailing theory, be accepted as legitimate?

6. The causes to which we thus refer the transportation of the materials of the principal strata—silex, alumine, lime, and vegetables—to their places of deposit, are certainly of sufficient energy to have accomplished their formation with great celerity. And a variety of proofs indicate that they were, in fact, formed in a very rapid manner.

Thus, that the vegetables which were converted into coal, were deposited and buried by the strata that lie above them within a short space, is seen from the fact, already stated, that the outlines of the stocks, branches, and most delicate leaves are preserved in every part of the bituminized mass unobliterated; which could not have occurred had they been exposed for long periods to the wear of the restless waters, and the action of decomposing forces.

That the strata, also, above them were deposited almost immediately is shown by the trees, trunks, and branches that project out of the coal, and are imbedded in the sandstone, shale, and limestone that lie above. Many of them rise to such a height as to pass through six, eight, or ten strata, and show by the perfect preservation of their forms, that they were enveloped to their tops before they had begun to undergo decay. The wood is usually silicified, while the bark is converted into coal. In some localities large fields, or forests of trees and stems standing erect in the places in which they grew, are found enveloped in a series of sandstones, shales, and limestones; indicating that five, six, or seven of those strata were deposited in very quick succession; as otherwise those trees would exhibit marks of decay. How could they have been thus preserved, if, as the common theory represents, hundreds, and perhaps thousands of years were employed in their burial, and they were during that period exposed to the action of destructive agents, sufficiently powerful, as is held, to disintegrate solid rocks and convert them into the strata? Six, eight, or ten of the layers were

sometimes formed, not improbably, in half the number of years. The rapidity with which they were deposited in those instances was, at least, such, that if it were the ordinary rate, sixteen or eighteen hundred years would be ample for the deposition of the whole series.

The condition of the fossilized animal relics indicates also that the strata in which they are entombed, were deposited with rapidity. The perfect preservation in many localities of the forms of fish, shows that they were covered by the strata in which they are imbedded before decomposition had begun, or they had been exposed to mutilation by other fish.

"The perfect condition in which the impressions of fish are found in the rock of Monte Bolca, and their extraordinary abundance, seem to show that the catastrophe which destroyed them was a sudden one, such as might have been brought about by the evolution of some of the noxious gases exhaled from volcanoes. I have myself observed the speedy extinction of life which takes place when carbonic acid is introduced into a vessel in which fish of several different kinds are collected; the first operation of the gas causing them to leap out of the water with convulsive energy, but in a few seconds, all muscular energy being suspended, all the fish without any further effort sinking lifeless to the bottom of the tub."—*Daubney's Description of Active and Extinct Volcanoes*, p. 146.

The skeletons of those of considerable size are often un mutilated, and dispersed through strata that cover extensive areas. That would naturally happen, if the clay or lime that enveloped them was thrown down in a few hours, or even a few days; but could not, had scores, and, perhaps, hundreds of years, as the common theory represents, been occupied in their deposition. Do dead fish now float in the ocean, or welter at the bottom, months and years without decay, and without mutilation by the living? Do their skeletons long remain unbroken, if exposed to the dash of breakers, and the wear of powerful waves, currents, and tides? If not, why should it any more, in contravention of the most certain physical laws, be supposed that they did then?

The condition in which the solid parts of testaceous and other similar animals are found, indicates with equal clearness that they were rapidly inclosed in the mass in which

they are imbedded. Shells and corals, in infinite numbers, are found wholly unbroken.

"The old fresh-water and sea-bottoms present us with the occurrence of animal remains so preserved, and amid such substances, that the sudden influx of waters charged with much fine matter in mechanical suspension may have destroyed multitudes of aqueous animals in some given area. At least their remains are so entangled amid this matter as to lead to this inference. That fixed creatures or others of slow movements could thus readily be overwhelmed, would be expected under such conditions at all geological periods. When, for example, in the vicinity of Bradford, the *Apicrinites* of that locality is found rooted upon a subjacent calcareous bed, one of the oolitic series, and entangled in a seam of clay, its parts sometimes beautifully preserved, it may be inferred that it was destroyed by an influx of mud from which it could not escape. In like manner, also, the preservation of long uninjured stems of various *emarginites* found amid the Silurian and other older deposits, on the surfaces of limestone and other rocks, and having had a covering of fine sediment, would appear to be explained. Sometimes, as in the Lias of Golden Cope, near Lyme Regis, multitudes of *belemnites*, some with even the ink-bag of these molluscs preserved, so form a seam of organic remains, that the observer is led to infer a sudden destruction of thousands of them over a moderate area. *Ammonites* are also sometimes found in great numbers, distributed in a depth of only a few inches, over areas of a square mile or more, as if suddenly destroyed. . . . It sometimes happens that the shells of molluscs show that when their animals were entombed, the space occupied by their bodies prevented the entrance of the sediment which enveloped them. . . . Multitudes of examples are found in certain areas and deposits where the presence of the animals in their shells should seem required. When we consider the probable voracity of numerous creatures in fresh and sea waters, and the multitudes of scavenger animals consuming decayed animal matters at all geological times, the discovery of certain aqueous reptiles preserved entire amid rocks, even with the contents of their intestines preserved, leads us to infer that their entombment, if not also their death, was sudden. And this appears the more probable when we find, as often happens, that in the same deposits the same kinds of aqueous reptiles are dismembered, as if by predaceous animals feeding upon them. While, at times, in the lias of Western England, the skeletons of *Ichthyosauri* and *Plesiosauri*, are so well preserved, that all or nearly all the bones are in their proper places; at others the bones

of these reptiles are dispersed, though not always far removed from the place where the animals died. In fact the appearances presented are precisely those of decomposition having been so far advanced, that the scavenger animals could feed upon the carcasses, and drag the bones short distances, so as somewhat to scatter them."—*De La Beche's Geological Observer*, pp. 515, 516.

The preservation of such multitudes of animals of all orders unmutilated, which admits of no solution, except on the supposition that they were suddenly destroyed and immediately buried, thus indicates decisively that the strata in which they are enveloped were deposited with rapidity. Is there any reason to believe that the unfossiliferous strata were not constructed with equal expedition? None whatever. All their features indicate that they had their origin in the same causes, and were formed under the same conditions.

7. This view of the mode in which the materials of the strata were introduced into the oceans and seas, suggests the probable reason that those animals that were invested with a covering of silex or lime, swarmed at periods in certain localities, in infinite numbers. The infusion into the waters of the ocean at those points, of the elements of which their shells are formed, perhaps at a temperature equal to or above that of the equatorial seas, and that rendered their propagation practicable through the whole year, may have been the cause of their extraordinary multiplication. The slight animalcula whose siliceous sheaths are in a few places accumulated in vast masses, cast their coverings periodically, and, like other creatures of that order, multiplied with a rapidity in an inverse ratio to their minuteness. The bulk of their relics is not greater perhaps in proportion to their power of increase, than that of some larger animals. There is, at least, no satisfactory explanation of their infinite multitude on any other theory. The supposition of vast ages during which they existed, is altogether inadmissible; for they are not common to all geological times, but confined to periods of comparatively slight length; and there are no indications that the strata formed contemporaneously with them, occupied a long round of ages. Myriads as innumerable as those of the infusoria that sometimes now animate every drop of

the ocean through hundreds of cubic miles, casting their sheaths at slight intervals, would in a few years accumulate masses as great as those imbedded in the strata.

8. It suggests a more probable solution than any other of the origin of rock salt, and the saliferous marls from which salt springs arise. Those marls were undoubtedly ejected, like all others, from the interior of the earth; and why should not the salt with which they are saturated have been ejected along with them? We know that soda exists in the depths of the earth, as it is a conspicuous element in many of the volcanic rocks; and chloride also, as it is an element of muriatic acid, which is one of the most common and abundant of the gases emitted from volcanoes.

“Muriatic acid seems to be generated during almost all the phases of volcanic action; for although some have attempted to establish a class of volcanoes to which the production of muriatic acid was peculiar, yet it would appear that there were none from which this gas is not in greater or less quantity disengaged.”—*Daubney's Description of Volcanoes*, p. 607.

Their ejection in combination, and in such conditions as to form rock salt, however it may transcend our comprehension, is no more incredible than many other processes, of the occurrence of which we have ample evidence. There is no other theory of its origin that is not perplexed with insuperable objections.

9. This view of the rapidity with which the strata were formed, is confirmed by the softness and pliancy which they appear universally to have retained, till the time of their upheaval. That they were so soft when elevated as to be susceptible of flexion without breaking, is seen from the curvatures and contortions to which those of every species, especially from gneiss up to the last of the shales, sandstones, limestones, and coal beds of the carboniferous system, have been subjected.

“Contorted strata are common on the skirts or flanks of many mountain chains, appearing to show that before the latter attained their existing forms, there was a pressure from the central parts outward, causing the lateral contortions.

"To produce this effect—as in the Alps, between Rigi and the Hospice of St. Gothard—we seem compelled to suppose the whole mass of the calcareous Alps—a series of mixed strata of limestone, argillaceous slates, shales, and sandstone, the former predominating—to have been in a yielding or comparatively soft state. We can scarcely suppose with any approach to probability, that the soft yielding condition of this mass should have continued sufficiently long to enable a succession of small shocks, of no greater intensity than those of a modern earthquake, to have acted upon it. The whole strongly impresses us with the idea of a powerful exertion, forcing the limestone and associated beds outwards."—*H. T. de la Beche's Theoret. Geology*, pp. 113, 114.

In some instances they form a simple curve; in others a series of curves, like so many waves; in others still they are folded over like a half dozen of the letter S joined in a continuous line. The folding, in some localities, is on so great a scale, that the strata must either have been drawn from a distance or else greatly expanded in length and breadth. In some parts of the Alleghanies the coal series within a half dozen square miles, would, if spread out on a level, cover two or three times that space.

"The most probable condition of contortion appears to be pressure of solid matter on yielding stratified substances, which, while they bend, also slide to a certain extent on the planes of stratification."—*H. T. de la Beche's Theoretical Geology*, p. 121.

No such softness and pliancy are retained by the stratified or crystallized rocks that now lie beneath the surface, however far they may be below the line of the sea. Though permeated by moisture, and, when first raised to the atmosphere, far more easily sawn or wrought with the chisel than after the water with which they are charged has evaporated, they yet are not sufficiently flexible to be bent without fracture. As then they must have continued in a pliant state till their upheaval was completed and they were moulded into their present form, it is manifest that their elevation must have taken place rapidly. It cannot have proceeded, as many geologists maintain, by such slow stages, as to have been prolonged through a series of ages. If protracted after emerging from the ocean through even a few

years, the heat beneath of the molten mass of granite by which they were forced upwards, and the action of the sun and atmosphere, would have desiccated and hardened them to such a degree as to have rendered them incapable of being bent into curves and folds without breaking into fragments. We have the most decisive evidence, therefore, that their upheaval was accomplished in a brief period; and that the vast round of years which geologists have regarded as requisite to that process, is wholly imaginary.

10. Their upheaval and subjection in that pliant state to the powerful breakers, waves, and currents of the ocean explains the denudations which they have undergone. Had they possessed their present hardness when rising through the ocean into the atmosphere, no such immense wearing away and such vast excavations as have been wrought in them would have been possible.

"Of the formations comprising the rocks of this portion of the State, ii. and iii. are a limestone and slate stratum, which are at all times more destructible than sandstone; but especially so must they have been in their soft and pulpy state at the time of their elevation from the bed of the ocean in which they were deposited. Hence they have been more deeply excavated than the harder ponderous beds of sandstone, of which formation iv. consists. We accordingly find formations ii. and iii. always in the deep and nearly level valleys, and iv. in the high and steep mountain ridges. Of the other rocks, formation v. consists chiefly of soft slates and calcareous slates. Formation vi., of limestone, which, like ii., was evidently of a very soft consistence when first uplifted, and formation viii. of a mass of slate and argillaceous rocks. These would all be liable to very extensive destruction whenever subterraneous uplifting forces should bring them within the reach of those tremendous currents, which those same uplifting actions set in motion."—*H. D. Rodgers's Report on the Geology of Pennsylvania*, 1838, p. 41.

The sea does not now wear the solid rocks that lie embosomed in it, or rise from its surface, except in a few positions where exposed to the most powerful breakers and currents; and there what it rends and wears away is scarcely appreciable, compared to the masses that meet the shock of its powerful enginey century after century without yielding. Myriads of ages would have contributed little towards

grinding down strata of such hardness, scores, hundreds, and even thousands of feet in thickness, over wide areas, scooping out valleys, and ploughing the broad passages betwixt the hills, in the bottoms of which the rivers cut their channels. But that immense rending and denudation was the natural result of the rapid upheaval of the strata from a level beneath the sea, in a condition so pliant as to yield to the violent currents and waves which that process itself must have created, and the resistless sweep and dash of ocean-tempests and storms. Under the impulse of those powerful agents, the parts most elevated would at many points be instantly swept away, and where a whole continent, like that of South America, rose at the same time, so as to cause the ocean to recede with a resistless rush hundreds and thousands of miles, its currents would necessarily tear up and bear off the strata over extensive regions. Instead of vast ages and incalculable periods, a very brief time, therefore, would be ample for the accomplishment of all the great modifications of that class to which the strata have been subjected. The cuttings accordingly through hills, the excavations of the valleys, and the removal of strata from large districts, and deposit of the detritus in others, are precisely such as would naturally result from the vehement commotion and violent currents of the ocean acting on such susceptible materials. On the prevalent theory, however, they are wholly inexplicable. If the strata on the tops and sides of the mountains and hills, and on the plains and depressed surfaces, were as hard at their upheaval from the ocean as they now are, no solution could be given of the vast degradation that has taken place at many points in rocky ranges and plateaus, the abrasion of solid masses from wide plains, and the scooping out of deep channels and valleys between the hills, arranged in the same relations to each other, and exhibiting the same outlines as those that are now wrought in yielding soils by deluges and floods that sweep over them.

11. The soft condition of the strata at their upheaval into the atmosphere, indicates the reason also of the excavations within a brief period by rivers of their deep channels for miles through rocky strata. Thus the Niagara must naturally have cut its passage back from Lake Ontario to near

its present fall in the lapse of a few years; inasmuch as the strata over which it passed were at first so pliant as easily to yield to the powerful impulse of the current and cataract. That that was their state, is indisputable, not only from the fact that the strata generally were unhardened at their upheaval, but that the same formations on the Helderberg and the Appalachians were actually subjected to curvatures and contortions, that show that under the surge and dash of such a mass of waters as the Niagara, they would have given way in a moment, and dissolving into their primitive particles, been borne off by the resistless current. To suppose that a long round of ages, or even a considerable number of years, could have been exhausted in excavating such a chasm in strata in that condition, is a consummate solecism. The length and depth of the channel, instead of proving that a long period elapsed during its excavation, present a resistless demonstration that no more time can have been occupied by it than passed between the upheaval of the strata and their acquiring such a measure of hardness as to enable them to resist, as they now do, the impulse of the waters. It is truly surprising that geologists, though aware of the evidences that the strata, at their elevation, were tender and plastic, should yet wholly overlook it in their theories of erosion and denudation, and proceed in their inferences respecting the time that was required for those processes, on the assumption that the rocks that have been swept off, or cut by deep gorges, must from the first have had all their present hardness.

12. The plastic condition of the rocks at the elevation of the mountains furnishes an explanation of the formation of the rounded stones, pebbles, and much, probably, of the gravel that are found in the vicinity of the great ranges, as the Cordilleras of South America, the Rocky Mountains, the Appalachians, and the Alps. At the sudden upheaval of those, chasms were opened in them doubtless, and explosions of gas, and not improbably of lava, took place, by which portions of the rocks through which they forced their way upwards, were torn into fragments, and projected with a rotary motion into the surging and rushing waters of the ocean, in the whirl of which they were borne off to a distance ere they reached the bottom, and stripped in the

process of their angles and points, and reduced to a circular or elliptical form. Their rounding was then soon completed by the ceaseless change of position and wear to which they continued to be subjected by the advance and recession of powerful waves, while the areas on which they lie were upheaving towards the atmosphere, and the ocean retreating to its present bed. It is noticeable that these vast bodies of stones, pebbles, and gravel lie at the eastward of the mountain range from which they were derived. Thus in Patagonia :—

“ Here—in Patagonia—in the tertiary formations—along hundreds of miles of coast, we have one great deposit, including many tertiary shells all apparently extinct. These beds are covered by others of a peculiar soft white stone, including much gypsum, and resembling chalk, but really of a pumiceous nature. It is highly remarkable, from being composed, to at least one tenth part of its bulk, of infusoria. This bed extends 500 miles along the coast, and probably for a considerably greater distance. At Port Julian its thickness is more than 800 feet! These white beds are everywhere capped by a mass of gravel, forming, probably, one of the largest beds of shingle in the world; it certainly extends from near the Rio Colorado to between 600 and 700 nautical miles southwest; at Santa Cruz, a river a little north of St. Julian, it reaches to the foot of the Cordillera; half way up the river, its thickness is more than 200 feet; it probably everywhere extends to *this great chain, whence the well rounded pebbles of porphyry have been derived.* We may consider its average breadth as 200 miles, and its average thickness as about fifty feet. If this great bed of pebbles, without including the mud necessarily derived from their attrition, was piled into a mound, it would form a great mountain chain!”—*Darwin's Journal of Researches in Natural History and Geology in the Voyage of the Beagle*, pp. 170, 171.

“ Near the mouth of the Santa Cruz the bed of gravel is from twenty to about thirty-four feet in thickness. The pebbles vary from minute ones to the size of a hen's egg, and even to that of half a man's head. They consist of paler varieties of porphyry than those found further northward, and there are fewer of the gallstone yellow kind; pebbles of compact black clay slate were here first observed. The gravel covers the step-formed plains at the mouth, head, and on the sides of the great valley of the Santa Cruz. At the distance of 110 miles from the coast, the plain has risen to the height of 1416

feet above the sea, and the gravel, with the associate great boulder formation, has attained a thickness of 212 feet. The plain, apparently with its usual gravel covering, slopes up to the foot of the Cordillera to the height of between 3200 and 3300 feet. In ascending the valley, the gravel gradually becomes entirely altered in character; high up we have pebbles of crystalline felspathic rocks, compact clay-slates, quartzose schists, and pale-colored porphyries; these rocks, judging from the gigantic boulders on the surface, and from some small pebbles imbedded beneath 700 feet in thickness of tertiary strata, are the prevailing kinds in this part of the Cordillera: pebbles of basalt from the neighboring streams of basaltic lava are also numerous."

* * * * *

"The transportal and origin of this vast bed of pebbles is an interesting problem. From the manner in which they cap the step-formed plains, worn by the sea within the period of existing shells, their deposition, at least on the plains up to a height of 400 feet, must have been a *recent geological event*. From the form of the continent, we may be sure they have come from the westward, probably in chief part from the Cordillera, but perhaps partly from unknown rocky ridges in the central districts of Patagonia. That the pebbles have not been transported by rivers from the interior towards the coast, we may conclude from the fewness and smallness of the streams of Patagonia. . . . That the pebbles in central and northern Patagonia have not been transported by ice-agency, . . . we may conclude from the absence of all angular fragments in the gravel, and from the complete contrast in many other respects between the shingle and the neighboring boulder formation.

"Looking to the gravel on any one of the step-formed plains, I cannot doubt, . . . that it has been spread out and levelled by the long continued action of the sea, probably during the slow rise of the land."—*Darwin's Geological Observations on South America*, pp. 20–22.

Beds of pebbles and gravel, formed of quartz, gneiss, and primary slate, are strewn in much the same manner on the Atlantic side of the Appalachians in Virginia.

"The loose aggregation and coarse materials of these beds give them so great a resemblance to the common diluvium of sand and gravel, generally forming the surface strata in this part of the State, as to render careful observation necessary in order to distinguish

between them; and even the closest inspection in some cases will not suffice for this purpose. This obscurity, however, does not apply to localities in which the tertiary beds are seen resting upon them, as in such cases the subjacent position of the sandstone or conglomerate determines its true geological character, the diluvial sand or gravel having its place above the tertiary.

"When the tertiary, . . . having been removed, . . . has been replaced by diluvial sand and gravel deposited on the broken surface of the secondary," still, "a marked difference may be noticed in their composition, especially in the comparatively large amount of white felspathic earth blended with the coarser matter of the upper secondary. Indeed, at most localities, however large may be the pebbles imbedded in some of the layers, the intervening matter will be found to possess the character of a soft felspathic sandstone, and some portions of the mass will display this character throughout.

"The pebbles thus imbedded in the finer material of these beds, sometimes in layers of many feet in thickness, but oftener in narrow *courses*, are frequently of great size, measuring even as much as eight or ten inches in diameter. They are of very various origin; some being from the primary region, and consisting of quartz, gneiss, and primary slates, while others are from the formations further west, and especially that lying on the valley (west) side of the Blue Ridge, and which I have designated as the first of the series of rocks of our great Appalachian system. These fragments of formation i., remarkable for their bright white color and their great magnitude, serve to distinguish the mass in which they occur from the overlying diluvium, in which nothing analogous has as yet been discovered. Forming thus a part of what may be considered as ancient diluvium belonging to the secondary era, they point to the extensive agency of the currents by which the heterogeneous materials of these upper secondary strata were swept together."—*Rodgers's Report on the Geology of Virginia*, 1839, pp. 36, 37.

See also p. 60 for a description of similar conglomerates and sandstones in the northern district east of the Blue Ridge.

That these immense masses were thus swept towards the east, indicates that a resistless rush of the ocean took place in that direction at the upheaval of the mountains from which they were hurled by volcanic explosions, or torn by the surge and sweep of the waters. This and the transportation of the pebbles to such a distance, may have arisen in a mea-

sure from the elevation of the western side of the continent first. If, instead of being raised throughout at the same time, it was elevated first at the western side, so as to form a slope beneath the sea, descending one, two, or three miles towards the east, the sudden upheaval of the Cordilleras to within a few hundred feet of the atmosphere, would have thrown the vast mass of waters that before rested on the plains of Patagonia, Buenos Ayres, and Brazil towards the Atlantic, so as to have drawn after them a current from the Pacific of hundreds of times the force with which it surges in an ordinary tempest, and swept the fragments ejected from the interior, and wrenched from the summit and sides of the mountain, to the distance of many miles; and its ceaseless waves would then at every roll along the inclining bottom, have borne them still further into the depths. These stupendous processes, which were wholly impossible on the prevailing theory, might thus have been dispatched in a very brief period, instead of occupying the interminable ages which geologists assign them.

13. These views of the period at which the strata were formed, and of the causes of the submersion of the land beneath the sea, and the retreat of the sea from the land, indicate the reason that no human remains are found fossilized in the strata. Geologists generally allege the fact that no relics of the human race are buried in the rocks in which so many animals of the sea and land are entombed, as a decisive proof that man was not created till after these rocks were formed. No conclusion, however, could be more irrelevant and groundless. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that any of the human family lived in this hemisphere, in Europe, or in those parts of Asia or Africa in which the strata have been examined. How, then, could their remains be entombed in the rocks of those regions? The strata, moreover, that now form the crust of the continents and islands, in the main, lay undoubtedly, previous to the deluge, beneath the sea, and were formed, at least chiefly, during the interval from the creation to that catastrophe. The primitive earth, occupied by the first pair and their descendants down to the flood, was then submerged—and doubtless by its own subsidence—and still continues to lie at the bottom of the ocean. For how could it have sunk beneath

the waters to so great a depth, unless on the one hand by its being depressed below the line it had before occupied, and on the other, by a corresponding elevation of the bed of the former sea? But such a subsidence of that ancient earth would have caused the ocean to rush on to it from every side, and carried its population and all other movable things from its exterior towards its centre, where they would naturally have sunk along with the wreck of their dwellings, fields, and forests, and been buried beneath the mud and sand with which the rushing waters would have become charged. To suppose that their bodies could have disentangled themselves from such a complicated mass, and floated off against the current to the other hemisphere, is to contradict the physical laws to which they and the movements of the ocean must have been subject. The total absence from the strata of this country, of Europe, of Africa, and Asia, of the relics of those then destroyed, is precisely therefore what was to be expected from the time and mode of their destruction. How could their remains be entombed in those strata which had been deposited *before* the epoch of the deluge, that swept them to their watery sepulchre? How could they obtain a burial in the seas where these strata were formed, when their distance was so great as to preclude their being borne to them? How extensive the continent, or continents and islands, of that world were, we have no means of judging. It is highly probable that they were of but moderate dimensions at their elevation on the third day of the creation; and they may have been enlarged at subsequent periods, as the race multiplied, and still have been at the time of their submergence, at the deluge, greatly inferior in extent to the present dry land. On that supposition, portions of the present continents might have been elevated into the atmosphere sufficient to have borne the vegetable growths out of which the coal beds were formed, without rendering the aggregate of the dry land greater than it is now.

14. It is highly probable, also, that at the reappearance of dry land at the close of the deluge, the extent of the Asiatic continent, raised above the ocean, was comparatively small; and that the great processes by which the strata generally were completed, and the continents and islands elevated to

their present positions, were continued through a considerable period after that event. And it may have been in reference to such a gradual reconstruction of the crust of the earth, that animals were preserved in the ark, notwithstanding—as there is reason to believe—there were to be new creations to stock the remote regions of Asia, and other continents and islands which were to be prepared to be peopled with animals more rapidly than those from the ark could multiply; or from their distance, the impassable barriers with which they were surrounded, and their different climates, were to require a creation on their own soil of peculiar genera and species. While, therefore, the animals preserved in the ark may have been sufficient in kinds and numbers to supply the wants of Noah and his family, and stock that part of the earth that was first raised above the sea; as other countries became fitted to support the same or other tribes, those with which they were peopled may have been called into existence by a new fiat. And on this supposition the existence in Europe, Northern Asia, Africa, and this continent, of the land animals whose relics are fossilized in the strata, is rendered consistent with the sacred history of the creation and deluge. These animals existed undoubtedly after the deluge, not anterior to it. Some of the species of Europe and Africa that were the most active, and best adapted to live in different climes, may have migrated from the east; but most were probably created in the regions where they perished. If during the two or three hundred years that followed the flood, Northern Asia, Europe, Africa, and America, emerged from the ocean, portions of them being gradually drained of their waters, and portions again submerged, or overflowed by deluges occasioned by the sudden elevation of other tracts; there was ample space for the life and destruction of the land animals whose remains are buried in the upper tertiary strata, gravel, and soil of these regions that were formed after the elevation, at least in a considerable measure, of their great mountain ranges.

The fact that certain classes of animals appear to have passed out of existence during the formation of the strata, and other forms of marine life and land animals that had not before inhabited the same regions were called into existence, and in their turn swept away also, is indeed alleged by

some as a decisive proof that vast periods must have been occupied by these changes. No conclusion, however, could be more unnatural. Vast periods surely were not required for the creation of animals. They are instantly called into being by the word of the Almighty ; and not in single pairs, like the progenitors of the human race, but in crowds, as at the first creation of the tenants of the air and the water, when the waters were commanded to "bring forth *abundantly* the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven ;" and the earth was commanded to "bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind ;" which also, like the fish and fowl, were produced, doubtless, not solely in one locality, but wherever the earth was prepared to sustain them. Their creation shows, therefore, that instead of innumerable ages, only brief periods were required for their being called into existence. Nor is the extinction of certain classes any more a proof of the lapse of long periods ; as all appearances indicate that their destruction took place by causes that were sudden and acted over great areas ; such as the effusion of deadly gases into the ocean ; the eruption of vast masses of siliceous, aluminous, lime, and other substances from the depths of the earth, that thickened the waters of the sea, and generated chemical processes that were fatal to animal life. Nor is there any reason to suppose that there were long intervals between the extinction of one series and the creation of its successors. The seas and lands were again repopulated, doubtless, as soon as they became fitted to be the residence of the tribes with which they were next stocked. The change of their population, therefore, by these rapid processes, instead of demanding a long round of ages, indicates that it was accomplished in a short time.

This supposition accounts also for the preservation of such of the relics of those animals as, instead of being entombed in the solid strata, were buried in the gravel or sands deposited above them, where they have been exposed to moisture and other chemical agents that were adapted to induce their decay. That bones of any species should be preserved in such conditions, through the vast series of ages which geologists assign to them—30,000 years, Sir C. Lyell

assumes, have passed since the burial of the Mastodon found in the gravel near Niagara—is physically impossible. If the same chemical forces that acted on that skeleton disintegrated during that period immense masses of the most solid rocks, and bore their detritus to the sea—as that writer holds—how is it that those bones, which were far more easily decomposed, should have withstood their destructive agency and survived almost unimpaired? The two assumptions are incompatible with each other. Many of the skeletons that are found buried in low grounds, bogs, and swamps, are probably of a comparatively recent date. Others were doubtless of a much earlier age; but four thousand years are probably as long a period as any of them could have been preserved without undergoing a greater measure of decay.

Such are the facts and considerations that confirm the view we have presented of the formation of the strata. We might add many others; but these are sufficient on the one hand to demonstrate the total error of the theory generally entertained by geologists; and on the other, to show that the strata, so far from offering any contradiction to the Mosaic record of the creation and deluge, are in entire harmony with it, and indicate in all their great features that they were formed with a rapidity as great as that history implies.

It will, perhaps, be said that although the views we have advanced seem to be consistent with the laws of the physical world, and with the appearances of the strata; and to show that all the great processes by which the crust of the earth received its present form, may have been consummated within the period we have supposed—the 1800 or 2000 years that followed the creation—yet we have produced no absolute demonstration that such was the fact; and that, therefore, there is room to doubt that they were finished in that period, and to suppose that they occupied a far greater series of ages.

To this we reply, that it is not necessary to our object that we should demonstrate directly and absolutely *from the strata themselves*, that they were completed in that period. Our aim is to confute the representation, that the strata themselves present resistless evidence that they were formed at a far earlier epoch than that to which the Scriptures refer the creation of the world; and thereby to protect the sacred word

from the charge and suspicion of giving a false history of that event; and that we accomplish by showing in the first place that the geological theory which ascribes an immeasurable age to the world, is altogether groundless and mistaken; and in the next, that the materials of the strata were placed originally in such conditions, and acted on by such agents as rendered their transfusion into the ocean, and deposition and upheaval in their present form in a period of eighteen hundred or two thousand years, consistent with the great laws of those substances and agents, and possible therefore; and thirdly, that their completion with such a rapidity is indicated and confirmed by their structure and condition. In accomplishing that, we do all that is necessary to vindicate the Scriptures from the charge to which the geological theory of an immeasurable age of the world has given rise, that they are convicted by the facts of science of error; and of an error so extraordinary and stupendous as to show that neither the history of the creation, nor any of the other professed communications from God, which they contain, can have been written by inspiration. And those propositions we have demonstrated. We have shown that the theory which ascribes a vast age to the world cannot be true, because it is not supported by any proofs; because if granted it could not account for the formation of the strata; because it is against the laws themselves of matter; and because it would preclude the occurrence of any of the great processes by which the crust of the earth has been formed and modified; such as earthquakes, the elevation of mountains, the eruption of volcanoes, the introduction of the materials of the strata into the ocean and dispersion over the areas where they lie, and the upheaval and dislocation of the strata after they were formed. A theory that presents such insuperable barriers to the accomplishment of these great processes cannot have any foundation in truth, nor present any solution of the facts which it is devised to explain. If the advocates of that theory are to demonstrate or render it probable that the earth has had a longer existence than is assigned to it by the Scriptural history of its creation, it must be by means wholly different from those which they have hitherto employed for the purpose.

The proofs are decisive also on the other hand, that the

strata may have been formed within the period of eighteen hundred to two thousand years from the creation ; and all the features of the strata indicate that they were built with as great a rapidity, and completed within as recent a date, as that supposes ; and the establishment from the laws of the chemical and mechanical forces by which the structure and modification of the earth's crust have been produced, and from the nature and condition of the strata themselves, of the possibility and probability of such a rapid formation, is all that is requisite to exempt the Scriptures from the imputation of error in their narrative of the creation and deluge. For if such a construction of the crust of the globe is consistent with the laws of those forces, and is probable, then neither the extent and thickness of the strata, the substances of which they consist, the relics they imbed, their upheaval and dislocation, nor any other peculiarities which they exhibit, present any contradiction to the sacred history of their origin and date ; nor furnish any ground for an inference against the divine authority of that history, and the other parts of the sacred volume that are founded on it, and assume and ratify its truth.

It is not to invalidate this conclusion, to say that we have not absolutely demonstrated *from the crust of the earth itself*, that it was wrought into its present shape within that period. To set that conclusion aside, they who dissent from it must prove directly and absolutely that the strata cannot have been formed, the igneous rocks thrown on to the surface, and the mountains upheaved in the manner, nor consummated within the period we have represented. But that they cannot do, unless they can set aside the grounds on which we found that conclusion. But in order to that, they must show, first, that there are no proofs that any such stores of the various substances of which the present surface of the globe is constructed, were originally treasured up in its interior, as that—on the supposition that there were proper agents for their transference to the surface—the strata might have been formed from them. But that they cannot show. It is against the most palpable facts. It is against their own admissions. It were to overturn their own theories of the nature and origin of all the igneous rocks, which they themselves regard as of immeasurably greater bulk than the sedi-

mentary strata. No certainty is more indisputable or holds a more important place in their speculations, than that the igneous rocks which were thrown up from the abysses of the planet are formed of identically the same substances as the sedimentary strata. They cannot deny, therefore, that all those elements were originally stored in repositories in the interior of the earth, and on a scale sufficiently vast to have supplied all the materials that were requisite for the construction of the sedimentary strata, as well as the crystallized and volcanic rocks.

As then that is indisputable, if they would set that conclusion aside, they must show that there were no agents that had access to those substances of sufficient power and activity to raise them into the ocean, that they might be deposited on its bottom and wrought into the strata in which they now exist. That, however, they cannot any more prove; as it is indisputable that such agents in fact existed, and actually raised to the surface the vast masses of those substances of which the igneous rocks are formed. This is acknowledged and maintained also by geologists, and is a conspicuous and important element of their theory. It is plain, moreover, that the fires of volcanoes, in forcing a passage from the deep recesses in which they were kindled to the atmosphere, must have driven up in an unfused state immense volumes of the substances that lay between them and the surface; and that those substances must have entered into the construction of the strata; as otherwise they would have formed a separate body; but no such masses exist on the surface. The igneous rocks and the sedimentary strata constitute the whole crust of the globe.

As then the requisite materials for the strata indisputably existed, originally, in the depths of the earth, and the requisite agents have existed and acted to transfer them to the waters of the ocean; it cannot be proved that they were not in fact drawn from those sources, unless it can be shown that if they had been introduced into the ocean in that manner, they could not have been so diffused through the waters and deposited as to have formed the existing strata. But that cannot be proved. So far from it, their diffusion and deposition in separate layers, like those of the strata, is precisely what would naturally and necessarily take place,

from the unfused and uncemented condition of those substances on their infusion into the ocean, and from the action on them of gravity, and the motions and pressure of the water. To this, indeed, geologists cannot hesitate to assent; as they represent the materials of the strata as having been transported by the tides and currents from the circumference of the ocean, where they suppose them to have been introduced by rivers, or beat off from rocky shores, into its interior, and thrown down on the areas where they were formed into the strata.

As, then, neither of these great points of the view we have advanced can be disproved, no method remains of setting it aside, unless it can be shown that such a construction of the crust of the earth is inconsistent with or leaves unexplained some of the other great processes to which it has been subjected, such as the upheaval and dislocation of the strata and the elevation of continents and mountains, or the incorporation in it of elements, such as the relics of vegetables and animals, that were not derived from the interior of the globe. But neither of these can any more be proved. Instead, all these extraordinary effects are precisely what would naturally result from such causes acting in such conditions, and could not have been produced by any other forces, nor in any other circumstances. They solve, accordingly, all the great processes that have taken place, and account for all the great results; while, on the prevalent theory of a molten globe invested by a granite crust—in which no new developments of an expansive force could take place, and thence no upheavals, no subsidences, no volcanoes, and no earthquakes—they are inexplicable and impossible.

As then those several positions are thus indisputable, it is clear that there are no means of proving that the strata were not in fact formed by those agents and processes. Instead, their construction in that manner is not only altogether possible and probable, but they are the only agents and processes that were adequate to their production. All the facts of geology are accordingly in harmony with the history given in Genesis of the creation and deluge. No means, therefore, exist of proving or rendering it probable that the world has existed through a longer period than that which is assigned to it by that inspired history; and the Scriptures

consequently are vindicated from the charge to which the speculations of geologists have subjected them, of a contradiction to the discoveries and deductions of that science.

The result at which we have aimed is thus established on indisputable and ample grounds. The facts of geology, in place of contradicting, corroborate the narrative in Genesis; and the fancy that the Scriptures have been convicted of an error, demonstrating that they cannot have proceeded from the God of nature, turns out to be wholly groundless and unjust.

This great fact, free as it is from all rational doubt, of infinite moment to the credit of the Scriptures, and flashing an effulgent light over the whole domain of theology, demands the earnest consideration, especially of the ministers of religion. The inspiration and authority of the sacred volume are boldly assailed, on the ground of the theory held by geologists of the immeasurable age of the world. That theory is undoubtingly and exultingly claimed to be deduced from the facts of the science "according to the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy;" and taken to be so, the conclusion is seen and felt by thousands and tens of thousands to be inevitable that neither the Pentateuch nor any other part of the Bible can have been written by the inspiration of the Almighty. That theory has been taught in lyceums, lecture-rooms, pulpits, and books, almost without obstruction for a half century, until it has gained the assent very generally of the press, and acceptance in all ranks of society. It has become, accordingly, a prolific source and powerful auxiliary of scepticism; and, unfortunately, has been aided in its mischievous influence, not only by the inconsiderate concessions of many religious men, but in a still worse manner by the unjustifiable and absurd methods by which it has been attempted to bend the history of the creation in Genesis into harmony with their speculations, which contradict it, and impeach it of fatal error. No duty, therefore, is more urgent on those in the sacred office than the rejection of those lawless perversions of the word of God, and confutation of the theory which assails its inspiration and veracity. They should no longer acquiesce in the seduction of their people—and especially the young, who are eminently exposed to the danger—into doubt and unbe-

lief, by the pretences of a superficial and but half matured science; but boldly and resolutely point out its palpable fallacies, its flagrant contradictions to the laws of nature, and its inconsistency with the principles and facts of geology; and show, on the other hand, the proofs that the works of God are in harmony with his word. No task is more incumbent on their profession; none can be easier or of more interest and benefit to their people.

And in this they will have the concurrence, we trust, of good men among geologists themselves. The science manifestly needs a reconstruction. The completeness to which it has been advanced has been greatly over estimated. There needs a clearer discrimination of that which is practical in it from that which is speculative—of the phenomena from the theories that are constructed to account for them. There needs a specific statement, which geologists have never yet given, of the axioms on which it is founded, and the principles by which reasonings and speculations respecting it are to be governed. There needs, especially, a rejection of unphilosophical assumptions and groundless hypotheses; and among them the theory of a world created in a state of gas or of fusion, invested with a granite covering, and continuing molten in the interior, which is the basis of the inference of a vast age of the planet, must be abandoned, as against the constitution of nature, at war with the facts it is employed to explain, and involving the science in endless self-contradiction and error. The results that are to be accounted for must be contemplated independently of hypotheses, in the light of the great truths which they themselves reveal respecting their origin, and of the agents that were concerned in their production, and such views alone adopted as are in harmony alike with causes, conditions, and effects. An effort, in short, needs to be made by its cultivators to free the science from the artificial and unnatural adjuncts with which it is now disfigured and embarrassed, to define its true principles more clearly, to ascertain more adequately its facts, to limit its deductions to such as have a legitimate basis, and to unfold and verify its consistency—the certainty of which will advance proportionally with the progress that is made in real knowledge—with the revelation which God has given respecting the creation of the world, and the

remodification through which it passed at the period of the flood.

And in this reconstruction we sincerely hope those who are devoted to the cultivation of the science in this country will take an active part. No finer field either for distinction or usefulness can present itself to the young men especially who are engaged in the profession. No superior theatre exists for the observation of the strata. There is none where they are found through their whole series on a larger scale; or yield more ample indications of the great processes by which they were formed. Let those, then, who have chosen the science as a profession, dismiss the unfortunate theories by which it has hitherto been embarrassed, and aim at a reconstruction of it under the guidance of the great principles we have suggested; and its facts will soon be unfolded in their proper relations, their true import be determined, and their consistency made apparent with the teachings of revelation. And this, instead of diminishing the interest and value of the science, will add to its attractiveness, its dignity, and its usefulness; and, in place of an enemy, show it to be what it legitimately is, a natural and efficient auxiliary of religion.

ART. II.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE
FIGURES OF ISAIAH, CHAPTER XXII.

THIS chapter contains first a prophecy of a siege of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, beheld in vision; and next, a verbal prediction of the removal from his office and captivity of Shebna, the steward of the royal household, and substitution of Eliakim in his place.

I.

"The sentence of the valley of vision," v. 1. The valley of vision is the valley of Jerusalem. That city, though itself on an eminence, is situated in a valley surrounded by

lofty hills, and was the scene in which God usually made his revelations of the future to the prophets.

1. Apostrophe. "What aileth thee that thou art wholly gone up on the housetops?" v. 1. The abruptness with which the danger and alarm of the city are thus revealed is very impressive. The scene was presented to the prophet in vision. He beheld the whole population on the housetops to witness, perhaps, the approach or operations of the besieging army, and indicating by their gestures, probably, their surprise and anxiety.

2. Metaphor in the use of full. "Full of stirs, a noisy city, a joyous city; thy slain are not slain with the sword, nor dead in battle," v. 2. The city is said to be full of stirs, as a vessel is filled with some element that occupies all its space, to signify that it was the scene of frequent excitements and commotions, sometimes tumultuous and noisy, sometimes joyous. That her slain were not slain with the sword, nor dead in battle, implies that they were to perish in a different mode; and it is indicated in the next verse that it was to take place in a form peculiarly discreditable and fatal to the city; through a consternation so excessive as to prevent them from even offering a resistance to the enemy.

"All thy chiefs fled together from the bow; they were bound; all that were found of them were bound together; from afar they fled," v. 3. At this spectacle, beheld by the prophet in the vision, he was overwhelmed with grief.

3. Elliptical metaphor, in denominating the population of the city, the daughter of his people. "Therefore I said, Look away from me. Let me weep bitterly; try not to comfort me for the desolation of the daughter of my people," v. 4. What more hopeless condition of the city could be conceived than that none of its chiefs should have courage even to face the enemy, but should, while they were at a distance, flee, and in their consternation and rout be universally taken and bound as captives? The prophet now describes the scene more particularly, and names the besiegers, their different classes of troops, and their arms.

"For it is a day of confusion, and treading down, and perplexity, to the Lord Jehovah of hosts in the valley of vision; breaking down the wall, and crying to the moun-

tain; and Elam bare the quiver with chariots, men, and horsemen; Kir uncovered the shield," v. 5, 6. That it was a day to the Lord of such confusion, terror, and disaster, denotes that it was such by his appointment, and to accomplish his avenging purposes. At the last onset the Assyrians were to break down the wall, and the population, in attempting to flee, were to be trodden down by each other. The cry—"to the mountain"—was the command, probably, or signal for the rush from the city to one of the neighboring hills, as presenting the only chance of escape—like the cry or shout of the officers of an army—"save himself who can"—when forced to a hurried and disorderly retreat. Elam and Kir are mentioned, not improbably, to show that troops drawn from the most remote and savage of the Assyrian provinces were to be present at the siege; Kir being the modern Georgia, on the river of that name running from the Caucasus into the Caspian; and Elam a northern province of Persia. Both countries were beyond Assyria, and inhabited by rude and warlike tribes.

4. Metaphor in the use of full. "And it came to pass the choicest of thy valleys were full of chariots, and the horsemen set themselves in array at the gate," v. 7. In all the vales around the city that admitted of the entrance of chariots and horsemen, as many were stationed as could act there. The prophet next describes the effect of the spectacle on the inhabitants of the city, and the measures to which they were to resort for their defence.

5. Hypocatastasis. "And he removed the covering of Judah," v. 8. The word translated covering, denotes a veil or screen, like that hung at the door of the tabernacle, to conceal that which is behind it. It is used here by substitution for that which had before concealed from the Assyrians the weakness and defencelessness of the city. Commentators, indeed, generally put an opposite construction on it, and exhibit the population of the city as the parties to whom the discovery of their dangerous condition was made. But that is inconsistent with the figure. It was to those *without*, not those within, that its helpless state was exposed by the removal of that which had before concealed it. The import of the figure, therefore, is, that God, by bringing the Assyrians suddenly into the valley, had shown them, in the

neglect of the rulers to inclose the principal pool within the fortifications, and even to repair the walls; and in the extreme surprise, agitation, and confusion of the people; how utterly incapable they were of a successful defence. The besiegers saw at a glance that the population had no competent leaders; that they had no foresight; that they were a disorganized and panic-stricken crowd that would be easily conquered by brave and disciplined troops.

The unexpected presence of the enemy in such strength at the gates aroused the population, however, to a sense of their exposure, and showed them the necessity of immediate measures for their defence; yet, in place of looking to Jehovah for protection and deliverance, they, with a fatal infatuation, relied on their arsenal, their walls, and themselves.

"And thou didst look at that day to the armor of the house of the forest," v. 8. This was a structure erected by Solomon, and made the depository of the golden shields and targets, and probably other arms of the city.

"And the breaches of the city of David, ye saw that they were many; and ye gathered the waters of the lower pool. And the houses of Jerusalem ye numbered, and ye pulled down the houses to repair the wall; and a reservoir ye made between the two walls for the waters of the old pool; and ye did not look to the maker of it, and the former of it ye did not see," v. 9-11. They had cherished such a confident persuasion, it seems, of their security—disregarding the forewarnings God had given them, and discrediting probably the reports of the rapid approach of the Assyrians—that they had made no preparation for the siege by repairing the breaches in the wall, and securing a supply of water, as was usual when a siege was expected.—2 Chron. xxxii. 3-5. Yet, although their surprise was adapted to impress them with a sense of their need of God's aid, and to recall to their recollection the deliverances he had granted them in former seasons of imminent danger, they continued in utter forgetfulness of him. Though the Almighty maker of the fountains, whose waters were indispensable to their life, was present, and but a look of recognition and desire was necessary to induce him to interpose for their salvation, they did not lift their eyes to him; they did not discern him, and see that

it was on him that their escape from the evils with which they were environed altogether depended. Instead, their blindness and recklessness increased in proportion as the signals of his avenging justice became conspicuous and indubitable, and their condition grew discouraging and desperate.

6. *Hypocatastasis*. "And the Lord Jehovah of hosts called in that day to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding on sackcloth; but behold mirth and rejoicing, slaying of oxen, and killing of sheep; eating of flesh and drinking of wine; let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," v. 12, 13. Calling to weeping and mourning, is put by substitution for the acts of God's providence, which, by showing that he was about to punish them, summoned them to recollect, confess, and lament their sins. But instead of awakening them to consideration and sorrow, the judgments with which they were threatened had precisely the opposite effect. They rushed under their influence into utter recklessness, and resolved to indulge in luxury and riot, without stint, while life should last. What an exemplification of the course apostates naturally pursue, when left of God to the unchecked sway of their principles and passions, although aware that it is to issue in their speedy destruction! It is by some thought to be against the very laws of an intelligent nature, and incredible, that the antichristian powers should go on in a direct and remorseless war on Christ's followers, after they shall have such decisive evidence as a resurrection, for example, of the witnesses would constitute, that they are his true disciples; but that will be as naturally their course then, as intolerance, tyranny, and a desire to wreak their vengeance on those who resist and expose them, are now. Nothing but the resistless power of God can prevent them from it. There are many who suppose that the great false teachers of the present day, the deniers and perverters of the fundamental truths of revelation, and preachers of another gospel in their place, would, as a matter of course, if they were let into a clear perception of the genuine import of their errors, instantly abandon and retract them. No misjudgment, we apprehend, could be greater. The blindness of alienation from God, pride, ambition, and party spirit, were never

overcome by mere argumentation, however demonstrative and unanswerable. No instance, we suspect, was ever known of an apostate's being recalled to the reception and acknowledgment of truth by a mere exposure of his errors, and vindication of the truth which he rejected. The usual effect on them of an argument that cannot be refuted is, to excite them to resentment, inspire them with a deeper hatred of the truth, and drive them to new shifts and deceptions to disguise their defeat, and keep up the air of conscious strength and rectitude; sometimes by disowning their own doctrines; sometimes by pretending that they are misunderstood; sometimes by professing to hold the very positions which they assail and deny; and sometimes by wantonly misrepresenting and traducing those who have exposed the errors of their system. The great rejectors of the cardinal elements of the work of redemption are usually positive and determined enemies of that which they disown; and show in their conduct that they are as irreconcilably hostile to God as they are to the scheme of his government. What striking exemplifications of this characteristic have been seen in the originators and leaders of theological parties in this country in the last thirty years. But this course necessarily terminates in their destruction. Being the enemies of God, they cannot be forgiven; they are left to meet the stroke of his avenging justice. "And Jehovah God of hosts revealed himself in my ears; surely this iniquity shall not be forgiven you until ye die," v. 14. However long they may live, they will never be sanctioned by God, nor acknowledged as his children, but will continue under his avenging sentence, and at length meet its infliction.

II.

"Thus said the Lord Jehovah of hosts, Go, enter to this treasurer, to Shebna, who is over the house," v. 15. The house of which he had the charge was the royal residence or palace. He had the care, doubtless, of its treasures and furniture, and determined probably—v. 22—who should have access to the royal presence, and who should not; and

exerted, therefore, an important influence on the measures of the monarch and the welfare of the people.

7. Hypocatastasis. "And say unto him: What hast thou here? and whom hast thou here? that thou hast hewn out a sepulchre here for thyself? Hewing on high his sepulchre; and graving in the rock a habitation for thyself! Behold, Jehovah will cast thee out with a cast, and covering will cover thee. Rolling, he will roll thee with a whirl like a ball into a wide region; there shalt thou die, and there shall the chariots of thy glory be the shame of thy master's house," v. 15-18. Casting, covering, and rolling are put for acts or allotments of God's providence by which Shebna was to be driven in an analogous manner from his station into exile.

8. Comparison of the haste and tumult with which he was to be forced away, to the motion of a ball thrown with a whirl. Each of the verbs expressing the act of God, and especially the comparison, indicates that he was to be driven away ignominiously and with resistless violence. What a threat from Jehovah to a proud and ambitious courtier, who had hewn him a sepulchre in a lofty rock among the tombs of the great, probably, that he might rest where his monument would attract the notice of the crowd, and transmit his name and rank to remote generations! His doom, so fatal to all his proud schemes, implies that he had abused his office. The wealth with which he had supported a splendid equipage, and built a costly sepulchre, was not improbably received in bribes for his influence with the court in favor of the unjust, or obtained by extortion, and made the chariots with which he fled to a foreign land, under the impulse perhaps of a popular insurrection against him, disgraceful in proportion to their magnificence, to the prince who had permitted him to exercise so profligate an administration.

9, 10. Hypocatastases. "And I will thrust thee from thy station, and from thy state he shall pull thee down," v. 19. It was not a simple ejection from the seat or apartment he was accustomed to occupy in the royal residence in the transaction of his official business that is here threatened; but the acts here used are substituted for analogous measures by which he was to be divested of his office and driven from the court.

11, 12, 13. Hypocatastases. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call for my servant, for Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah; and I will clothe him with thy dress, and with thy girdle will I strengthen him," v. 20, 21. These acts are used for the acts of providence by which the monarch was to be led to appoint Eliakim to be treasurer of the household, and invest him with the badges of the office.

14. Hypocatastasis. "And thy power will I give into his hand, and he shall be as a father to the dwellers in Jerusalem, and to the honor of Judah," v. 21. Giving power *into his hand* as though it were a substance having solidity and form, is put by substitution for giving him authority by investing him with the office to which it belonged.

15. Comparison of Eliakim as an officer, to a father to the people of Jerusalem and Judea. This implies that Shebna had acted the part of a tyrant, devoid alike of justice and of humanity.

16, 17, 18. Hypocatastases. "And the key of the house of David will I put upon his shoulder; and he shall open and none shall shut; He shall shut and none shall open," v. 22. Placing the key upon his shoulder, is put for the act of investing him with the charge of the house; and shutting and opening, for the particular acts in which he was to exercise his power over it. It has been generally supposed from the use of these expressions, Rev. iii. 7, in reference to Christ, that they are there a quotation of this. We have shown, however, vol. iii. p. 582, that there are reasons for the belief that the key of death and hades, instead of David, was originally the expression of that passage.

19. Metaphor in denominating him a nail. "And I will fasten him a nail in a sure place, and he shall be for a glorious throne to his father's house," v. 23.

20. Metonymy of house, for the family residing in it. The promise that he should be for a glorious throne to his father's family, implies that he was to bestow favors on them as lavishly as though he were himself the monarch, and they belonged to the royal line.

21. Metaphor. "And they shall hang upon him all the honor of his father's house, the offspring and the issue," v.

24. Here Eliakim is still exhibited as a nail, and the honors of his family are represented as hung upon him, to signify that they acknowledged them to be derived through him, and to be dependent for their continuance on his continuing to retain his station. By the offspring are probably meant, the immediate children of his father, and by the issue, the children of his children.

22. Metonymy again of thine *house*, for his father's family.

23. Hypocatastasis, in the use of vessels. "All vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all vessels of flagons," v. 24. Vessels of small quantity are obviously used as a substitute for the inferior or subordinate officers who drew their appointment from him.

24, 25. Hypocatastases. "In that day saith Jehovah of hosts, shall the nail fastened in a sure place be removed, and be cut down, and fall, and the burden which was on it shall be cut off; for Jehovah speaks," v. 25. The nail and the burden hung on it, are now used as representatives of Eliakim and the offices he had conferred on his father's family; and the removal and fall of the nail, and separation from it of the burden it had supported, are used to represent his removal from his office and the loss thereby by his family of their official places and honors. It is supposed indeed by many commentators that this prediction refers to Shebna instead of Eliakim; but that is shown to be mistaken by the consideration that it is Eliakim alone who is declared to be a nail fastened in a sure place on which the honors of a family were hung. No such character or relation is ascribed to Shebna. What was to occasion the fall of Eliakim, whether a change of the monarch, a neglect of some duty of his station, or popular dislike, there is no intimation. The language implies that the event foreshown was an ejection from office, not a departure from life.

ART. III.—THE EXCELLENCE AND IMPORTANCE OF TRUTH.

BY REV. SERENO D. CLARK.

In a previous article we remarked that truth might be considered in three points of view; as existing in things them-

selves, or viewed as reality; as existing in the mind, or viewed as the precise idea or conception of a reality; as existing in speech, or viewed as the true idea of a reality transferred by words or other signs of thought to the tablet of another's breast. In treating of the excellence and importance of truth, it will be unnecessary, however, to follow out systematically this arrangement, or to pursue separately the illustrative trains of thought which fall under these respective distinctions. For though the term, truth, will be used in these several classes of ideas or relations indiscriminately; yet in which specific sense, or as representative of which particular class of relations, will be sufficiently apparent by its connexions.

But we may be asked at the very outset, why undertake to prove or elucidate the excellence and importance of truth? Is not this a self-evident proposition, one felt instantaneously without consideration? We admit it in part. And yet, are the excellence and importance of truth felt in such a sense as to lead to decided results? Do men *act* as if truth were supremely excellent?—a treasure worthy of the most earnest pursuit. What are the indications in the reading community? Is instruction, or amusement, there the great object? What books are most eagerly sought? Are not tales and romances, where life-like pictures exhilarate, rather than inform; or where the reader, borne on radiant clouds, may float languidly away amid shadowy scenes into utter oblivion of life's actualities? Or, if books whose chief aim is the inculcation of truth, are not those selected, where this stern and intellectual, yet graceful beauty is represented as rustling in silks, or flaunting in tinsel; or where a story constructed to strike the fancy and charm the taste, is made the gilded vehicle; indicating that the pleasures of the imagination are, after all, the great object to be obtained, and truth, at best, but secondary? Indeed, how few are found willing to toil up the steep, rough pathway of truth, unless its unevenness is first smoothed away by the strewing of flowers, and they can swim deliciously along in their cushioned rockaways. The same is essentially true of those who seek instruction from the living voice. It must be sweetened as the bitter medicine for the child. Truth must live in a picture—its light be seen streaming through a brilliantly varie-

gated medium. It is an admitted fact, and justified by multitudes, that not the most instructive public teachers, but the most imaginative, or the most marked, either by grace of manner, or some singularity, are the popular favorites. There is little, indeed, of that honest, earnest love of truth for its own sake; that iron, persevering inquiry as to what it is, and that patient, straightforward endeavor to grasp it, which leads one to go to the bottom of a subject, turning it over and over, so as to be sure of obtaining correct views. How little too of this earnest, indefatigable search after truth for its intrinsic excellence, do we find even in a portion of the religious world! Is not, even there, a theory or partisan view sometimes deemed of more importance to be maintained, than the careful ascertainment of that foundation on which all theories and views must firmly rest, or vanish like the visions of a dream before the morning's brightness? Is not even there, a crude, ill-formed opinion, mere froth upon the stream, set afloat from some half-crazed brain, or rather wholly depraved heart, eagerly seized by thousands as sufficient ground on which to build hopes for immortality?

It may be profitable, therefore, while dazzled with the elegancies and brilliants of the refined in literature and eloquence; while we hear so much, and perhaps justly, in praise of taste and sentiment, their charms and influence on the character; are so often invited to revel among the clouds, or to walk the rainbow, that we almost forget that we are denizens of the solid earth; while we see so many around us, even if we ourselves are not rushing along with them, vainly chasing the cloud-shadows flying across the seed-fields of life,—It may be profitable, we say, for a time to fix our minds on the sober realities of things, the matter-of-fact world, in which is our present allotment; in other words, to contemplate the excellence and importance of truth,—that alone with which we have to do when we enter on our disembodied existence. For aside from the greater advantages accruing to our intellectual natures, and the holier influences shed on our moral destiny from such contemplations, there is a beauty in the erect and unbending aspects of truth itself, not less than in the sweeter and more dazzling coruscations of the imagination, as there is a beauty in the

primeval rocks soaring in mountain heights, or stretching in gigantic layers, ribbing the earth and forming the basis of its crust, not less than in the vivid green and starry blossoms that embellish its surface.

We begin with the excellence of truth. In showing this, we remark in the first place that *God has revealed himself a God of truth.* One principal design of Jehovah, in revealing himself to his rational and moral creatures, was to render them joyful in his service and worship. He has represented himself, therefore, a Being of absolute perfection, the sum and essence of all excellence, and thus worthy of this supreme end of their being, in agreement with the reasoning of the Psalmist, "Praise the name of the Lord, for his name *alone* is excellent." God has also declared that "he is a rock; his work is perfect;" that he is the standard of moral perfection; "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect;" and as a prominent ingredient in this perfection, which all are to imitate and adore, he has placed his truth. He affirms that he is "a God of *truth*, and without iniquity." He passed before Moses and proclaimed, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth." The Psalmist says, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne, mercy and *truth* shall go before thy face;" and the inhabitants of heaven sing in rapturous hallelujahs, "Just and *true* are thy ways, thou King of saints." Thus, in presenting himself as possessed of a character worthy of the adoration and praise of all, God exhibits his truth as an essential part of that character. Now, if truth constitutes a part of the supreme excellence of Jehovah, it must be in itself supremely excellent,—as worthy of pursuit as the knowledge of Jehovah himself.

Again: *Such is our moral constitution that we can regard God as supremely excellent, only as possessing immutable truth.* When we contemplate Jehovah as surveying infinity at a glance, as containing in his own mind a complete picture of universal being—an exact idea of himself, of every creature, whether man or angel; of every existence, with its qualities and relations; of all his own purposes, and all the plans and purposes of his creatures; in a word, of every circumstance and event that has existed in eternity past, and every cir-

cumstance and event which will exist in eternity to come—the view awakens the highest admiration and wonder. We feel that he is indeed a glorious being. But if we view him as deficient in the true conception of the least reality throughout the length and breadth of existence, we regard him as defective, and can no longer extol him as the universal sovereign. That simple, bright ideal of perfection, inseparable from our notion of Deity, vanishes at once.

Unchangeable veracity is, if possible, still more essential to our idea of Deity. For it is only as possessing an invariable disposition to communicate to his moral creatures an exact image or knowledge of things, just so far as he makes them any communications at all—as faithful alike to his threatenings and promises, that we adore him as the supremely excellent. Then we feel that he is worthy to sit on the throne. Indeed, the whole holy universe, when they regard him as exhibiting a desire to deal truly with the least of his rational creatures, and are convinced that this, with him, is an abiding principle, instinctively extol and praise him. But, should he exhibit the slightest disposition to deceive one of his moral subjects, it would at once destroy all their respect and reverence; they could no longer regard him as worthy to be exalted “Lord over all.” Thus we are so constituted that we can conceive of God as God, and approve of him as the universal sovereign, only as we regard him unchangeably true; and we are, therefore, incapable of regarding truth as other than intrinsically excellent.

Again: *God can approve of us only as we are veracious.* He has said—“Ye shall not lie one to another.” “Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile.” “Putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor.” “A false witness shall perish.” “A lying lip is but for a moment.” So unequivocally has God, who bids us by precept and threatenings attain the highest point of human excellence, enjoined truth as an essential part of that excellence, and reprobated falsehood.

Again: *We can approve of human character only as it is decidedly veracious.* The truth-seeking man, who endeavors to obtain well defined ideas of whatever comes within the reach of his faculties, till his whole soul becomes radiant with truth, as the dew-drop gathering the beams of the sun

into its bosom, brilliantly reflects his full-formed image; who manifests a fixed and settled disposition to convey to others a true conception of objects, their qualities, and relations, as far as in him lies; who makes no promises without a reasonable prospect of fulfilling them; is faithful to answer all reasonable encouragements which he has awakened—such a man we respect, esteem, admire. We feel confidence in him. He is to be depended upon; all delight to honor him. But the man who equivocates, quibbles, hesitates, comes not up boldly and frankly, and states things just as they are; who makes promises and breaks them—pledges, and violates them—is false-hearted, deceitful, crafty, treacherous, we instinctively despise. No one feels that he can trust him; no one feels safe in transacting business with him; because his word and pledge are alike held lighter than chaff, which the wind whirls at will.

We feel that one guilty of any crime merits our disapprobation; but we deem the liar *consummately mean*. Every man of the least honorable feeling despises, loathes him from the very centre of his soul.

Again: *We can approve of ourselves only as we are veracious.* As we despise others for falsehood, treachery, and deceit, we despise ourselves for similar offences. The noble-minded man never looks upon himself so despicable as when he has been betrayed into unjustifiable deception. Besides, every man has in his bosom a conscience—that sure director of conduct—which carries both the oil of joy and the adder's sting. When we discover within a disposition to speak and act in conformity with reality, this principle exerts a soothing efficacy, awakens a peaceful emotion which speaks of rectitude and truth. But when we are guilty of falsehood, or feel a disposition to deceive, then it darts its fiery fangs; it harrows with remorse, sometimes even thundering with a voice which shakes the very citadel of the soul, telling of dishonor, of hollow-hearted wrong, and of ruin.

Thus man is intellectually framed to the love of truth. We will explain. By love of truth, we mean not love of holy or gospel truth, which the phrase is sometimes used as signifying; we mean simply a mental taste, or relish, or instinctive desire, as the love of parents for their offspring,

a love of music, or of natural scenery. In this sense we say that man naturally loves truth. The child evinces this principle working in his infant breast. How will his eyes sparkle and his whole countenance glow with pleasure when he seizes hold of some new truth! Indeed, the desire of knowledge, or instinctive curiosity, which is characteristic of all of the least intellectual elevation, and that vulgar love of novelty which is almost a universal passion among the uneducated, are but different developments of this natural love of truth. The neglectors of knowledge respect the learned; and even liars admire veracity in others, and despise treachery. The child first learns deceitful arts, and utters falsehood only to gratify some selfish feeling, to attain some fancied good, or to avoid some fancied evil; and continues the practice only from the same motive, and by the force of habit. The act itself of speaking falsehood is certainly no more pleasurable to the natural sensibilities of the soul than speaking truth. Why, then, should falsehood be preferred? Unquestionably, the human mind, unwarpd by prejudice and selfishness, loves truth and abhors deceit—a point important to be understood—for besides demonstrating that truth must be excellent to beings constituted as we are, it is the ground out of which grow some of our strongest obligations to the right apprehension and just appreciation of truth.

But it may be objected that mankind are fond of fiction. True it is, that we are endowed with imaginations, by the aid of which we conceive objects, and combine scenes and imagery in a high degree lovely, beautiful, and sublime; and we are so constituted that we experience great delight in contemplating these creations of the fancy. Indeed, influenced by the inducements of taste, one sometimes becomes enamored with fiction, especially in youthful years. But this is a perverted state. The pleasures of imagination, and the excitement attending them, are allowed to rise disproportionately, or to usurp a transient control over the dictates of reason and the love of truth. But this no more proves that the absorbing love of fiction is a natural state of mind, than that an ungoverned thirst for intoxicating drinks is a natural state of the appetite. For, let one whose taste is thus vitiated, engage in the pursuit of truth, and he will

soon find the love of it gaining the ascendant. Hence people, as they advance in life, especially those engaged in the acquisition of solid literature and science, lose, in a measure, their interest in fiction, and that racy relish for the fascinations and witchery of fancy which they felt in the freshness of life's morning.

Besides, the whole science of criticism, especially that part of it which relates to fiction, poetry, and the fine arts generally, evinces the love of truth. For taste or sound judgment approves of fiction only as it carries along with it an illusion of reality. The story must be natural, the plot and circumstances in harmony with probability, the characters be made to act as living agents of the same capacities and in the same situations would reasonably be supposed to act: otherwise taste is offended. This is the decision, not only of the magnates of criticism, who professedly preside over our literary tribunals, but of all who are in the habit of reading and passing judgment on the thousand romances of the day. How often do we hear the remark that such and such a character is too perfect or a mere caricature, that such a scene is overdrawn, and that such an exhibition of passion is extravagant; showing, after all, that it is these reflected lights of truth, sparkling along the current of fiction, which give to it its peculiar fascination. True, men of little cultivation and experience in the world may be captivated with exaggerated and marvellous recitals, because they are borne along by an illusion of reality, connected with a kind of mental fervor which attends the illusion; either their æsthetic principles being too little refined to become sensitive to the absurdity, or they are so much pleased with the intended illusion and accompanying excitement, that they thoughtlessly yield themselves up to their sway. But the more cultivated are not pleased with such marvellous creations, because, though perhaps exciting, they discover in them no resemblance to truth. Hence, too, men of strong reasoning powers, with little sensibility and imagination, are rarely pleased with works of taste, because, while contemplating their charms, they are impressed with no illusion of actual existence.

Thus, amid the winds and waves of passion, aroused by the power of fiction, the love of truth, like an anchor,

steadies and holds the soul, rocked and tossed though it be. The love of truth is a principle which will work itself to the surface, will give a coloring to the stream of thought and feeling, though riled and perturbed by a thousand foreign substances. Envelope, indeed, the soul in the mists and smoke of fiction as you please, and still the love of truth sits in the centre like a vestal fire, shedding its genial light through the whole. Thus we are so constructed intellectually as to love truth—to esteem and admire it as of the greatest excellence. Not that we naturally desire to conform our conduct to the truth. Ah, this is a very different question. Indeed, we are frequently so bitterly opposed to the duties which truth prescribes, that we transfer our opposition to the truth itself. Of this, however, more hereafter. But if truth be not of the highest excellence, our minds are not so wrought by the hand of our Creator as to teach us truth, but falsehood.

Such are some of the considerations showing the inherent excellence of truth. We see its holy image not only sketched by the inspired pencil, and spread before the world that all may gaze upon it and admire; it is also graven on the inner chambers of the soul, that we may turn our eye inward, and read its excellence, and feel its beauty there.

Now if—

“It is not in the power
Of Painting, or of Sculpture, to express
Aught so divine as the fair form of Truth!”

If while

“The creatures of *their* art may catch the eye,
—— *her* sweet nature captivates the soul;”

if truth, aside from its influences on the mind and destiny, is itself thus intrinsically excellent, an object of beauty on which the inward eye may gaze with a kind of ravishment, why should it not be thought rational to pursue it for its own sake? If there is, consequently, a beauty in the inventions of the reason as well as in the creations of the imagination—in the demonstrations of Euclid, in the connected trains of thought in Edwards's *Treatise on the Will*, in Butler's *Analogy*, or Paley's *Evidences*, as well as in the wizard fancies of Shakspeare or Scott, why should not tracing the

glittering chains of thought and inferences in closely compacted arguments, be as conducive to true intellectual refinement as weaving the golden web of fiction, or soaring on the wing of poetry? Why should they alone, who revel amid the wild and often incoherent combinations of romance, or dwell amid the more life-like sketches of a chaster fancy, sometimes rendering themselves exquisitely nervous, or morbidly sensitive, over their freezing or melting, harrowing or soothing scenes, be supposed to have all the taste and elegance of sentiment worth possessing? To admit and act upon such a conclusion, would indeed be indicative of intellectual sloth. For unquestionably there is a grace of mind, a chasteness of thought, a refinement and elevation of sentiment, a strength if not a delicacy of conception, caught from the pages of those writers whose works task most severely the reason, which the lighter productions of a so-called politer literature never impart. The former consolidate, the latter enervate the mind. The hardest stones alone receive the highest polish.

We will now consider the importance of truth; or truth in its influences.

All will acknowledge the importance of affections and desires truly excellent and dignified. But the excellence and dignity of affections or desires depend on the dignity and excellence of the object towards which they are directed. If the object of affection is excellent, the affection itself is excellent; if the object is unworthy, the affection itself is unworthy. For instance, a love for a sinful object or act can never be a worthy affection. A suitable love on the part of a parent towards his child may be an excellent affection; but an inordinate affection towards this worthy object is not excellent. Fear may be an excellent affection, when it has the holiness of the divine character, and the threatening of divine wrath for its objects; but when its objects are spiritual rappings, the ghostly visions of distempered nerves, or a crazed imagination, it is no longer excellent. Thus, carry the illustration as far as you please, the excellence of the affection will always rise or fall in the same scale with the excellence of its objects and the degree of affection they deserve. Now, by the laws of mind, an affection or desire implies an object, and that object embraced by the intellect

Then, the excellence of the affection depends on the excellence of the intellectual idea towards which it is felt. But a delusion, an error, a creation of the fancy, may be embraced by the intellect as well as truth; and it may awaken the feelings of the heart. But error in a rational being is always debasing, and a love of it must be equally debasing. An affection or desire, therefore, for a delusion or error, however pleasing, cannot be excellent, or worthy a being whose destiny is the greatest of realities interesting to man—immortality—and whose duties in life and condition hereafter are to be determined by truth.

But we need not spend our strength in elucidating the importance of truth metaphysically. It would be at once apparent, could we but rise out of the dreamy, unrealizing state in which we love to dwell, and admit the simple truisms, that we are real beings, not airy shadows; that we live in a world of realities, not of dreams; that our lives and the various agencies by which they are sustained are realities; and that it is by acting in conformity with realities, not with fiction, that we gain riches, conveniences, social pleasures, and the esteem of others. The whole of life would thus instantly show itself to be one long, unrelaxing grapple with the actual state of things around us; not dalliance with the visions of fantasy.

One may easily see the importance of understanding truth, or the real state of things around him, and of acting accordingly in this world's transactions—that he must know what constitutes food, or pine with hunger; its qualities, or be exposed to poison; the properties of water, or perish; must understand the nature of fire, or soon die of cold, or be consumed in the flames; must understand something of the selfishness and all-grasping disposition of man, or be soon stripped of his last pittance. A parent cannot skilfully train up a child to become an intelligent and useful member of society, without knowing something of the make of the infant mind and the methods by which it is moulded. One cannot act discreetly in maintaining civil government, its institutions and laws, unless he knows something of the principles best adapted to promote the peace, happiness, and security of political communities; nor decide wisely in choosing rulers, if he knows nothing of their abilities, dispositions,

or principles. Would one visit a distant place, he needs to know in what direction it lies, and the best way to reach it. Thus, in all worldly transactions, we have to deal with unbending realities, not with the dreams of romance; to become successful in any of the relations and pursuits of life, a just conception of things is indispensable; a distorted view but confuses and confounds.

Truth, especially truth in communication, is also the foundation of social confidence, and thus of society. If one always adheres faithfully to principles of rectitude and truth, we have unquestioned confidence in him. If he deceive us but once, our confidence is shaken; if twice, it is still more weakened, and a very few instances of deception will destroy every vestige of confidence. Were men universally to practise deception whenever their fancied interests demand, there could be no such thing as confidence in the world. And what would be the consequence? There could be no civil government, not even an absolute monarchy; for a tyrant cannot carry on his machinery of oppression without confiding in his servile creatures. The whole world would be Ishmaelites. Thus society is based on confidence, and confidence on truth; and therefore society has its very existence in truth. Indeed, there is no proper place for falsehood and treachery but the world of perdition, where the father of lies reigns over his kingdom founded in lies, and administered by lies, without a rival.

Such being the importance of truth in temporal affairs, let us now glance at its importance in spiritual and eternal things. *Eternity is a reality as well as time; the soul as well as the body.* Indeed, our spiritual relations are realities far higher and nobler than those of our present existence. God, the Father of our spirits, his government, his law, and revealed word, are glorious realities. Sin, the violation of the divine law, the punishment due to it, and the threatenings uttered against it, are painful realities. The mission of the Son of God, the redemption he wrought out, the Spirit he purchased, and its promised operations to renew and sanctify the soul, are joyful realities. The judgment-seat, the retributions there awarded, the joy of the saved, and the woe of the lost, are most solemn realities. Thus, in all our spiritual concerns, we must deal with truth, with stern, unchanging

truth. In the great and momentous affairs of the soul, the imagination has little to do; in securing its prosperity we must act, not in conformity with visions, and dreams, and impressions, but in conformity with holy and unchanging realities.

In order to act our part successfully in this world, is it important to conform our conduct to the actual state of things, while, in respect to the coming world, this conformity to truth is a matter of indifference? Do we deem it of moment to travel the direct, the best road to a specified point, in transacting the business of life? And are we not travelling to eternity—to pleasure or pain interminable? And is it not important, and most highly important, to know the right course to heaven and to pursue it? Are the roads to that blessed world so multifarious that he who travels in almost any direction will reach it? Or is there but one way, and that broad enough to receive all travellers across the present scene to eternity? Jesus Christ has settled this question. “Strive to enter in at the strait gate, for strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” We must know, then, precisely what truth is, for truth is the way; and be sure to walk in her heaven-lighted path.

If we are under the government of an omniscient and almighty Being, are in his hands as the clay is in the hands of the potter, it is certainly well to know it. If we are bound to please him, and to mould our characters to his, we need to be informed as to what are the precise elements of his moral character. If he has promulgated a law, we ought to understand that law. If the obedience required is so strict, that he who offends “in one point is guilty of all;” if it is a spiritual law, reaching to the thoughts and intents of the heart, as accountable beings we need to know all the peculiarities of its far-reaching power. If we are transgressors, “dead in trespasses and sins,” under the wrath and curse of God, it is for our interest to know it; to know the extent of our turpitude, and the fearfulness of divine wrath; for if there is a prison of outer darkness, “where there is weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth,” prepared for the finally incorrigible, it is of the highest importance that the truth be accurately understood. If deliverance from wrath to come

is freely offered through the blood of the crucified Son of God, and the terms of salvation are clearly stated, and are such as lie within the capacity of all to perform, it is certainly of infinite moment to be made acquainted with the facts. If "there is none other name given under heaven whereby we can be saved," if there is but one ark which can carry us over the floods of divine vengeance, and but one entrance into that ark, no language can express the importance of our knowing it. If we are forbidden to trust in our own righteousness, and we ignorantly do trust in it, the error will prove fatal. If required to exercise a "faith which worketh by love," and a repentance which is after a godly sort, and we exercise other feelings which we term repentance and faith, we shall continue in sin and perish. If we "must be born again," or never see the kingdom of heaven, and we have wrong ideas of the truth, the mistake will prove ruinous. If we are entirely dependent on the sovereign grace of God, ignorance of it will involve error, which, if not destructive, will, at least, greatly retard our spiritual progress; and, if ignorant of accountability and the day of final awards, we shall be likely to live regardless of God and duty.

We might extend the number of particulars; but these are sufficient to show that in all our preparations for the untried scenes before us, we are dealing with truth, and with *truth alone*. Indeed, the entire path to the throne is paved with truth. Jesus Christ is the truth itself, and he who would arrive safe at God's right hand must keep in view that morning star. Truth has its root in heaven, and it yields the precious fruits of heaven in the soul. Error, on the contrary, has its source in hell, and its malignant streams flow far and wide, breathing the subtle miasma of eternal death. Neither error, nor acting in accordance with error, ever assists one in his upward course; but always ensnares and retards. Is he a Christian? It is a dark spot on the bright disk of truth, as it beams on his mind, obscuring his way. Is he wandering in sin? It is a fitful blaze flattering him to his doom.

Besides, the word of God, spiritual truth, is the appointed instrumentality to subdue and renovate the guilty soul. This is the sword, burnished in the blaze of the godhead,

with which the all-conquering Spirit pierces the sinner's heart, first to wound, then to heal. It has already slain its millions, and by slaying, infused the breath of life everlasting. Error is never such an honored instrumentality; the Spirit never works by it. We know that some imagine error, or some slight degree of it, to be almost as beneficial as truth. But this is a great mistake. Distorted views of things may produce effects on the mind as well as reality. Error may awaken the sympathies and excite fears—cause weeping and trembling. Who has not wept at fiction? Who has not trembled at a dream? But with these affections awakened by error, strong as they may be, we may say, we think, with confidence, the Spirit of God has nothing to do; they have not the least softening or purifying efficacy on the heart; they tend only to harden, and plunge into still deeper pollution. How absurd to suppose the contrary! For what, in the conversion of men, is proposed to be accomplished by the agency of truth? Life is to be imparted to the dead; purification to the corrupt. Now can that which has no element of life in itself immediately impart life? Can that which is impurity itself make pure? Can soot paint the dark substance white? What is error? It is the offspring of sin; of that which is the cause of all spiritual defilement and death; of that which built the walls and forged the chains of the everlasting prison. Can this child of sin be the instrument of sin's destruction—that which the life-giving Spirit will employ to inspire life, and to break those chains which itself has forged? Will the Holy Spirit use, directly, an instrument which comes right up out of the pit, to purify the soul, and fit it for heaven? Error, it is admitted, may be made the *occasion*, in the providence of God, of the advancement of truth and holiness, as he will always overrule the wrath of man to the promotion of his own designs; but it can never be the immediate cause of such a result. No; poison is no nutriment to the body; it yields neither physical activity, strength, nor beauty; but sickens, palsies the power of life, and destroys. So is error to the soul. Truth is its aliment; error its bane.

“Truth is but one with heaven—
The sparkling spring of life's eternal stream.”

If then we would be instrumental in saving men, we must be content to use the simple means which God has appointed. We must press, in every legitimate way, the truth of God on the moral sensibilities, till they bleed or glow ; and then pray for the applying influences of the Holy Spirit ; resignedly leaving those we would benefit to the disposal of Him "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

A few thoughts growing out of our subject we wish in this connexion to suggest, particularly to youth exposed to the temptations of scepticism, or who are inconsiderate and vain enough to deem it a mark of manliness to forswear allegiance to the opinions of pious parents, or to the restraints of religious education ; proudly asserting their independence of mind and freedom of thought ; recklessly opening their minds to the reception of infidel sentiments ; while they affect to sneer at the long-established principles and usages of our holy religion. But do such really manifest either manliness of character or independence of thought ? Is it not rather a course of which an able and ingenuous mind might well be ashamed ?

But to proceed. If truth is reality, then it is fixed and immutable. For a reality can never be otherwise than a reality ; an existence can never be a non-existence. Non-existence may take the place of existence ; yet at the point of time and space at which it existed, it will always exist ; and while eternity rolls on, as the eye reverts to that point, the then existing object will rise up before it. In common language, what is done cannot be undone. We speak with reverence. Omnipotence himself cannot make a reality a non-reality. True, God can create and destroy ; but these acts are no alterations of truth. We sometimes speak of new truths, and new objects of truth : but the term *new*, in such cases, is used relatively, either to our own minds, or to the acts of creation. An act of creation, when past, will for ever stand ; and ere it was accomplished, it was from eternity a certainty in the future. At any given point in the eternity past and to come, in that duration which has neither beginning nor end, every reality either then actually existed, or existed in the unchanging purpose of Omnipotence. So that truth is one and the same immutably. It

was the same before the fiat of creation was put forth; it is the same since; and always will be the same while "immortality endures." No argument, nor ingenuity, nor sophistry, can alter it. It hangs, an immovable sun, in the firmament of eternity, and no power in earth or hell can quench a ray of its light.

Here the infidel is powerless; he may bewilder his own mind and the minds of others in view of truth, but he cannot put out her light; he may destroy himself by dashing against the foundation of the moral universe, but truth will still survive and triumph over his ashes.

In the light of this thought, we see the amazing folly of those who maintain, or pretend to maintain, that truth is merely what one believes. If one, say they, believes a reality to exist, then it does exist; but if he disbelieves its existence, then it does not exist, or not in such a sense as to bring good or evil to him. Such, if they deign to quote the Scriptures at all, are fond of repeating such passages as these; "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he." "But to him that esteemeth anything unclean, to him it is unclean;" arguing just as if our *bare conception* of things could not only change their nature, but, so far as each individual is concerned, had power both to bring into existence, and to blot from existence, at pleasure. So that one, on this theory, can call into being a world of enchantment, in which he can muse or revel with delight, if he will but believe its existence—an opinion utterly without meaning, unless it import that we are mere beings of fancies and impressions; and as we are such here, so we shall continue to be for ever; and the same kind of impressions which haunt us here, and are the cause of our joy and sorrow, we shall carry with us into the spirit-world to haunt us still, and to give us joy or sorrow through eternity. An idea of this sort, however shadowy and unsubstantial it may appear to us, may reasonably enough be supposed a floating fragment from the airy fabric of philosophy erected by the German idealists,—those profound dreamers in mental science, by whom our perceptions of the external world are regarded as mere forms of the understanding, or interpreted plainly in English, as mere impressions of the mind, awakened according to certain inherent laws, but destitute of all proof of their prototypes in

external realities. This theory, stripped of its refinements and mysticisms, disrobed of the cloud-like attire which the imagination has thrown around it, and incorporating itself with the ideas of the uneducated, or forming itself in the thoughts of the practical American mind, may have come forth in the conclusion that all our relations—that all we are, or are to be, are nothing more than our perceptions or impressions. It is but carrying up this idealist notion of mental laws, from the understanding to the reason, and making our ideas of God and spiritual realities but forms of the reason, or mere mental impressions: and thus all our ideas, both temporal and spiritual, are realities no further than they seem to be such.

The bare mention of such an opinion is a sufficient refutation; for when laid bare, it appears the height of absurdity to every thoughtful mind. And yet, that men, professing to be reasonable beings, and often boasting of extraordinary mental abilities, should ever imbibe such sentiments, shows, not only the blinding nature, but the downhill course of error. Let the mind but once become habituated to receiving distorted views of things, and it will itself become so distorted, that it can believe anything, however irrational or inconsistent. Indeed, a taste for error may be acquired, as a taste for intoxicating drinks or narcotic drugs is acquired, so that truth, presented in all her loveliness, will be rejected with disdain, while error is drunk in with avidity, as the swine passes by the glittering jewel, but eagerly devours the filthiest garbage. In view of this law of a perverted mind, let the young take warning. Cultivate your intellects as God intended they should be cultivated. Train them by and to the investigation of truth, not in the weaving the net-work of sophistry, or in endeavors to hush the voice of obligation. Indulge in *such* mental effort, or in captious objections to revelation, and in baseless speculations respecting your own being, and the being, character, and government of God, and you may contract a mental disease, by which the healthful propensities of the soul will be destroyed; error will not only be regarded as truth, but be intellectually preferred to truth; and when the soul is in a state to make such a preference, the token of perdition appears on the brow; one is prepared to enjoy a sense of

security while treading the pathway of sin and delusion, being emboldened, by the assurances of which he is conscious in the inmost recesses of his darkened soul and seared conscience, to believe that he is rising heavenward, while he is rushing to perdition.

The error of those who confound truth with opinion, or seem to suppose that truth is nothing more than certain conclusions to which the mind arrives, is nearly identical with the last, involving the same absurdity. Yet, under this form, it assumes greater plausibility, and is embraced by greater numbers. Many talk as if the truths of the gospel, instead of being fixed and abiding realities, were mere notions of the reader; as if what the unchanging God asserts, may be modified at discretion by the opinions of his fallible creatures. This may arise in part from the fact, that there are different views concerning the import of Scripture. Therefore, when you utter the most solemn and momentous truths, "we doubt not," say they, "you are sincere, but then it is merely your opinion." No matter how cogent and convincing the arguments adduced to establish your position; no matter how much of that earnestness, springing from a solemn conviction of the truth uttered, you may evince in enforcing it; with them all goes for nothing. Other men have different views of the same moral or scriptural truth, and one opinion is just as good as another opinion. Undoubtedly, one opinion is as good as another, if both are equally at variance with truth. But if one opinion is more in harmony with truth, or entirely in harmony with it, one opinion is not as good as another; truth is more valuable than error. When a conclusion is an exact conception of truth, then an opinion is the truth itself in the mind. The Bible, therefore, is not a mere bundle of opinions, but a system of immutable truths. Men, blinded by sin and selfishness, may have different views of gospel truth, but this discrepancy of views cannot alter eternal realities. Men may call good, evil, and evil, good; may put darkness for light, and light for darkness; bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. But this will not change the nature of things. Good will remain eternally good, and evil eternally evil. The ten thousand differing opinions about the Bible will not alter a single sentiment. The promises and threatenings of Jehovah will for ever con-

tinue the same ; and He will fulfil the one, and execute the other, to the very letter. Surely, this frittering away truth, till it appear only in the broken fragments of opinion, is folly, which, in the end, will sting like the adder. Then, while it is granted that one bare opinion is as good as another, let it be remembered that truth and error are not alike ; they are immutably opposites ; and let us bear in mind that if we ascertain not the truths of the gospel, and form not our lives and characters in harmony with them, we must everlastingly perish.

A vague idea, a shadowy impression, that what is said by the messenger of God is nothing more than his opinion, may exist, perhaps unconsciously, in the minds even of good men, especially in respect to some important, though unpleasant, truths ; an impression which exerts a most disastrous influence on their own progress in holiness, and when uttered, working downward on the impenitent mind, assumes a still more malignant form, scattering far and wide the seeds of spiritual ruin. For if professors of religion thus feel and speak with regard to the doctrines or duties unpleasant to them, the impenitent will certainly feel encouraged to speak thus touching doctrines and duties disagreeable to them. So that when the ambassador of Christ, with all the solemn sanctions of his office, denounces the terrors of the law and everlasting destruction, exhorts to flee from the wrath to come, and entreats, with all the yearnings of his heart, to be reconciled to God through a crucified Saviour, it is all coolly regarded as a mere matter of opinion. In this manner, not unfrequently, every avenue to the hearts of the impenitent is barred up, and barred up by whom? *Sometimes* by the professors of godliness.

We see also, in the light of the principles already elucidated, the *great wickedness of imbibing destructive error*. Fundamental error respecting spiritual things is by no means innocent. God has spread out the creation before us, enstamped with the lineaments of his character ; and in his word his will is most distinctly unfolded. Our love of truth, as we have seen, is instinctive ; and we are endowed with reason, and furnished with the various means of acquiring a knowledge of things. We have senses to perceive the objects of the physical world. He who opens his eyes and

directs them to the sun, the hosts of heaven, or to objects around him, cannot help beholding them. The difference between heat and cold, bitter and sweet, we cannot avoid perceiving. Why? Because we are so constituted. No more can one, would he suffer his reason to work as God created it to work, avoid seeing the relation between cause and effect; nor, as he looks abroad over the fields of creation, observes the operation of those stupendous physical agencies with which it abounds, and the innumerable lines of beauty which are drawn over and around it, notices its ten thousand marks of intelligence, wisdom, and benevolence, can he avoid seeing in these, as in a mirror, not only an all-powerful and all-originating cause, but also a wise, benevolent, and personal cause. In the same manner, he cannot help discerning that this great first cause must be absolutely and intrinsically perfect, possessed of every intellectual and moral excellence; and if the first cause or creator is perfect, he must be a perfect governor over all; and if a perfect governor, as he surveys the moral disorders so rife in this part of his dominions, he must decide, in the counsels of his infinitely holy mind, to appoint a day in which he will judge the world, and accomplish the decisive work of retribution. We are so constituted that, would we let reason work according to its native tendencies, we could no more avoid discerning these truths than we could avoid seeing the variegated beauties of a landscape spread out before us. We know it is sometimes supposed that God, in framing our natures, fitted us to discover those truths which lie on the surface of things, and qualify us for the common duties of life, while he neglected to give those mental principles by which moral and religious truths are as easily discovered. But this is a strange conclusion, and as inconsistent as strange. Would God be either wise or benevolent in giving moral and mental constitutions to his accountable creatures, should he so mould them that physical and secular truths would be more readily discovered than moral and religious relations?—that duties to one another and to this life, should be more easily or clearly taught than duties we owe to our Creator and tend to the soul's everlasting welfare? This, to our understanding, would be neither reasonable nor kind. Nor is it so. And when we add the clear

shinings of revelation to the more dim, though indubitable, light of nature, we may safely say, if one does not recognise the fundamental truths of natural religion and the gospel of Christ, that it is not because he has not *evidence* of them, but because prejudice or prepossession has perverted his mind and distorted his views. And this is not merely our opinion. Christ has decided: "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd." Here Christ has distinctly stated, if not the only cause, certainly the grand, leading cause, of all fundamental error, both in morals and religion. *It is the depravity of the heart*; and let this declaration of him who is the truth itself be suitably regarded by all who are amenable to his awful bar, and can recklessly indulge in scepticism.

In consideration of this fact, and of all this flood of evidence both from nature and revelation, and of this instinctive love of truth with which we are endowed, how black must be the crime, and how bitter the condemnation, of that man in a Christian land who wilfully blinds his mind to spiritual truth, and resolutely perishes in open resistance to the offers of redeeming mercy!

And such cannot be excused on the ground that mankind are not to blame for their belief. This is a favorite subterfuge of errorists and sceptics. But it is a garment of fig-leaves. We all acknowledge that we are to blame for not being disposed to perform all required acts which we have the natural ability to do, and for being disposed to do prohibited acts which we have natural ability to abstain from doing. This principle is equally true of knowledge, or of belief, as of conduct. We are guilty for not knowing what we have ability to know, and for not believing what we have evidence to believe. The plea, however, that one cannot help his belief, we are free to acknowledge, contains a truth, though it also contains an error; and in the sense in which it is urged as an excuse for misbelief, it is utterly erroneous. One is not to blame for being ignorant of what lies at the bottom of the ocean, for he has never traversed its hidden caverns to learn what they contain; nor

has any other intelligent being wandered through the watery mass to bring him information. One is not to blame for not believing or not understanding precisely what the spiritual body is with which we shall be clothed at the resurrection, for we are not informed. But that there is a spiritual body we are bound to believe, for this is revealed. We are not bound to believe the precise mode of God's existing three persons in one being, for of this we are not informed. But the doctrine of the Trinity we are under obligation to believe, for this is revealed. Thus it is with all those truths written on the pages of creation and providence, which we are so constituted that we naturally discover, and also with those which are more fully revealed in the word of God. These we are obliged to believe, so far as they are unfolded to our apprehension, for to this our ability extends.

But what is the precise force of this plea, so often in the mouths of sceptics and flagrant errorists, of inability to believe, affirming, "I cannot believe the full inspiration of the Scriptures?" "I cannot believe the supreme divinity of Christ?" "I cannot believe that God is angry with his rational creatures?" "I cannot believe that he has prepared a hell of fire for those who refuse to believe on his Son?" It is simply this. Belief rests on evidence, and we are so constituted that we cannot rationally believe anything without evidence. On this ground rests the difference between our obligation to believe truth and our obligation to believe error or delusion. Error or delusion has no real, though it may have specious evidence to support it. Truth that comes within the reach of our faculties has evidence to support it. That which has no evidence to support it, we are under no obligation to believe. That which has evidence to support it, we are under obligation to believe. Hence we are obliged to believe all truths, the evidence of which falls in the circle of our possible knowledge; while we are not obliged to believe error or fiction, because we are not bound to find evidence which does not exist. One may, therefore, justly say, "I cannot believe error or the dreams of enthusiasm;" but he has no right to say this in regard to truth, especially gospel truth, the evidences of which are so clearly spread before us. For does he doubt them? He is only to ascertain the evidences on which they are based, and his doubts will vanish. His neglect to make

this investigation, or his refusal to admit the evidence when seen, is the real cause of his error, and constitutes mainly his guilt. There is, then, no force at all in this plea, "cannot believe," with regard to the truths of the gospel; for if errorists would just throw away their prejudices and let the light of truth shine in upon their minds unobstructedly, they would find the evidences of them to be entirely satisfactory. "Cannot believe!" What, O doubter, can you not believe? That the Bible is a fable? that the grave is an eternal sleep? that there is no hell for the finally incorrigible? Well may you doubt these negations, for they are but the fumes of corrupt affections. But the great facts and truths of the gospel you have no reason to doubt; for these you can believe, if you will. Ah, this is the piercing thought, which will rive the soul of the fatal errorist for ever: "You could have believed, if you would!"

For one to say, therefore, concerning these fundamental truths, that he does not and cannot believe them, and that he is not to be blamed for his scepticism, is just as irrational as for one, when pointed to the sun at bright noonday, or to the stars at night, to blind his eyes and say, "I can see no sun to illumine the day, nor stars to adorn the night; I do not believe there is any sun or stars, and you need not call me an idiot or madman because I regard all these, your pretended lights in the sky, as mere creations of the imagination; for I tell you a man is not to be blamed for his belief." You would not hesitate to pronounce such an one a fool. But he who disbelieves the existence of God, the true character of his government, the authenticity of the Scriptures, personal accountability, the day of judgment, the eternal woe of the wicked, and all the primary principles of revelation, and says, "I am not to be blamed, I cannot help my belief," is justly exposed to the same charge. Christ will say to him, "On this very ground your condemnation is based. You loved darkness rather than light, because your deeds were evil."

Hence, an *imperious duty*. If the consequences of truth or error, in its moulding influences on the soul, are to be everlasting, being nothing less than depravity or holiness, perdition or salvation, then, as accountable and immortal beings, we should seek nothing so earnestly as truth; avoid

nothing so carefully as error. This is not only the conclusion of reason, it is also the voice of inspiration. Says the wise man—"Buy the truth and sell it not;" that is, procure truth at whatever cost, but never sell it; never part with it.

A knowledge of truth is a matter of personal acquisition, as decidedly as faith and repentance are personal exercises. It should be the endeavor of every one, therefore, to look at things as they are, for himself, not through party or sectarian guides, or as beclouded by selfish interests. These always darken our views. Truth is a pure star, shedding from afar its light on our world; we should contemplate it as it shines unveiled; gaze upon it till its fair image is imprinted on the soul. "Correct views of things" should be a guiding maxim. Not that one should aim at universal knowledge. This is impossible. Every one should make up his mind, that while in the present state he must remain in ignorance of many things which it would be pleasing to know. But so far as his knowledge extends, he should endeavor to make it accurate. He ought never to take up, we do not say, with limited, but with distorted conceptions. When, however, one has pursued a train of thought into those dim regions where the lines of human knowledge are indistinctly drawn, and all things appear like shadows, he should cease to assert, and acknowledging his ignorance, patiently wait for an enlargement of vision. Airy speculations, efforts to grasp the untangible—those subtilized essences of things which dwell only in the dreams of metaphysicians—are by no means to be approved. To speculate is not always to reason, nor are the results of speculation always acquisitions of knowledge. This should be realized. But views of all the important duties of life and of the relations of our immortal being, so far as revealed, should be clear and comprehensive. An *inquiring* state of mind, not a *sceptical*, but *investigating* state—one ever open to *conviction*—is always appropriate for a rational being. It ill becomes such a being to be satisfied with notions or impressions formed on superficial inquiries; and then, convincing himself of their correctness, bring all his pride of opinion to the maintenance of them, as though they

were undisputed verities. This is sometimes done, but it is building on the sand. The only proper course is to dig deep, to consider and reconsider the grounds of belief, and be sure to maintain no influential opinions which will not endure the all-searching eye of Jehovah; remembering that all our opinions must pass his dread scrutiny.

We will suggest two or three considerations fitted to stimulate in this work of thorough investigation.

A well balanced mind is of immense importance to one's happiness and usefulness. But the mind is formed and strengthened by the examination and reception of truth; and his mind alone is in a well poised state, who has just apprehensions of all the relations and duties of life, and of all essential truths which relate to his spiritual existence, so far as they lie within the reach of his capacities and circumstances. It is thus, and only thus, that a noble symmetry can be given to the different principles of the soul. The mind of an errorist is necessarily in a confused, chaotic state; lines of thought must then cross and recross each other; inconsistent views dash one against another in wild confusion; for truth alone is harmonious with itself. The mind surging with conflicting opinions and emotions, is every moment liable to be thrown from its balance. An equilibrium can with difficulty be preserved between the feelings and the reason, and the reason and the conduct. The temperature will not be uniform; activity and zeal will depend much on the breath of passion and the wave of events.

But such a state of mind must materially impair one's usefulness. For how can one, with conflicting thoughts and trains of thought, with contending emotions and desires rising and swelling within, employ his powers to the best advantage in any department of labor? Indeed, no man can act with the greatest effectiveness without homogeneity of views and unity of purpose, conducting to concentration and perseverance of effort. True, this opinion, as to the importance of an equalized reception of truth, at least in any high degree, and the consequent equipoise of our mental principles, is not always entertained. It is thought by some that one may be useful, though his opinions are

unformed and fluctuating; though momentarily liable to some intellectual freak, to fly away, like a bird of passage, to a distant clime,

“To nothing fixed, but love of change.”

It is thought by others that one may be useful, and enjoy the happiness and peace of religion, though he hold extremely one-sided or imperfect views relative to fundamental truths; deeming it, for instance, a matter of indifference whether he receive the great doctrines of grace or deny them. “What if he does,” say they, “disbelieve our entire depravity, God’s sovereignty, particular providence, and eternal purposes, the divinity of Christ, a vicarious atonement, justification by faith alone, or the perseverance of the saints? he is very active; he seems to be doing good.” True, he may do good; but is he doing as much, taking into view all his relations, as he might do? The palliators of lax views seem to forget that these great truths lie at the foundation of Christ’s kingdom; that they are the great regulators of conduct; the great principles out of which grow the rules and precepts which should guide us. Is one as useful, other things being equal, as he would be, did he embrace these regulating truths and imbibe their spirit? As well affirm that one may lift as great a weight when standing on one foot as on both, and do as much work with a single finger as with the hand, or that a ship may sail as well without ballast as with it. Besides, these great truths are not only the regulators, the ballast, but the instruments by which the Christian works; and can the artist execute as skilfully without his instruments, or with only a part of them? Furthermore, does he who entertains these imperfect views really enjoy as much of the happiness and peace of religion, as he who yields assent to and loves them? What is religious enjoyment? It is enjoyment in God, in thoughts of his providential care and atoning love; in brief, in the truths of the gospel generally. Can he be as happy in disbelieving a part of the divine character, a part of his moral government and plan of redemption, and their associated truths? This would be equivalent to saying that one may be as happy, though a portion of the sources of his enjoy-

ment were dried up; that the father of a family may be as happy, though he lay a portion of its beloved members in the grave.

Some talk in the same manner concerning the practical duties of life. For instance, one may be entirely engrossed in the cause of temperance. He may scarcely think of any other evil, at least scarcely raise his hand to remove it; but it is said, "He is doing well, let him work; he may do good in that department of reformation." True, he who directs all the energies of his mind to the cause of temperance, may promote this virtue, at least for a time. But he will be almost sure to do injury, or prevent good in other respects. The reason is, that the principles of the divine law do not press on his conscience with equal force, and his moral ideas, being entirely absorbed in one virtue, become warped. Moreover, being consequently very zealous in some duties while he neglects others, he will be seen, by those whom he would move to virtue, to be inconsistent; and thus the whole amount of the influence he might otherwise exert is not felt. His zeal is like the light of the sun streaming through the cracks and chinks in the wall of a dilapidated temple; and its results like the few straggling, stunted, frail spires of grass and weeds growing within the half-shaded inclosure of the same fractured walls, compared with the luxuriance of field and meadow in the full flush of summer. By this, however, we would not affirm that one should endeavor to do everything at once, or that one may not sometimes devote his life to the illustration of some one truth, or the enforcement of some one class of duties. But while he does this, his mind must be illumined by the full effulgence of truth. He must unfold the specific truth as only a part of a whole, and keep in view its relation to that whole, and enforce the specific duty as only one among a thousand; and as no more important than others which stand in the same relation to God's glory and man's good. It is by neglecting to keep in view the relations of a truth or duty, and leaving the mind to work, and the sentiments and feelings to shape themselves without the aid of related principles, that one sometimes becomes a man of a single idea; and not necessarily because he devotes his life to the promotion of a single class of duties. The difficulty is, he does not

view the particular truth or duty as a development of a first principle, clearly perceived in its relations and bearings ; and by consequence, while the individual point grows like a beacon-light before the mind, others are comparatively lost to his view. Everything is seen reflecting the glimmer of this one truth.

It is, therefore, by embracing the whole circumference of truth, as seen in its primary principles and development, that we may hope to labor with the greatest success for the amelioration of our race. "Truth is great and will prevail." Not denunciation, nor hard speeches, nor fault-finding, nor partial views of truth, are great ; but truth, in its *living proportions*, is great. This is a point important to be understood by those who would enlist with efficiency in the noble work of reform. *Such must take broad views of things.* This is indispensable, indeed, to all engaging with success in any moral enterprise. Then, when these comprehensive ideas are definitely seen, they should be pressed with all their vital energies on the conscience. We should endeavor to bring those we would influence into a symmetrical, healthful state ; endeavor to suspend the feelings, affections, and sentiments of the soul around one regulating centre, and attach that centre to the throne of heaven. Unless the reformed are brought into a healthful state, the reformation cannot be radical or entire. It will be but superficial work. We should always bear in mind that there may be empiricism in the work of reform as well as in the medical profession. But truth, presented in its relations, will not be empirical in its results. We may safely trust in God that it will receive his blessing ; and minds thus influenced, will be invigorated, and become, themselves, burning and shining lights.

Let every one, therefore, aim earnestly at the knowledge of truth ; spiritual truth, especially, in its fundamental principles and their connexions, should form the theme of his profoundest meditations. He should diligently exert the powers which God has given him, and improve the opportunities graciously afforded for this ennobling purpose. The very effort will prove elevating. The pages of creation and providence should be read, and read with an honest mind. He should take the word of life, and, as in the presence of the Almighty Governor, the judgment-seat, the retributions

of eternity, the Saviour of the lost, pour over its sacred treasures, knowing that they, and they alone, are fitted to make him "wise unto salvation," and render him an efficient co-worker with God through the attending influences of the Spirit.

This is certainly the only consistent course for the Christian. For every true Christian desires, above all things, growth in grace, and augmentation of power in moulding others to virtue and holiness. Hence he must be most deeply interested in divine truth, as the indispensable means of these desirable results. Yet multitudes seem insensible to this Christian want; and many, even true disciples, make but a snail's progress towards heaven, because they have garnered up so little evangelical truth. They resemble the shrivelled corn on a barren soil. How many, too, utterly fail, or are greatly hindered in their efforts to do good for the same reason. How often do we see Christians acting with great injudiciousness, and therefore, unsuccessfully, because they have habituated themselves to the contemplation of but a part of the grand circle of divine truth. Their religious sensibilities are ardent, but exceedingly irregular. Their zeal is great, but not according to knowledge; sometimes confined to their own bosoms, it blazes up with an intensity which consumes itself; and again, kindling enthusiasm in others, it spreads like flames amid the withered leaves of the forest, and expires as soon. They lay schemes of usefulness, but they falter by the way. They endeavor to bring sinners to Christ, but only drive them further from him. What they need is *judgment*. But judgment is formed by receiving and retaining in the mind proportional views of truth; judgment being but the symmetrical views of truth compared. As symmetry is the soul of beauty, so it is of moral effectiveness. The word of God contains no unnecessary truths; each has a service to accomplish, either in the formation of character or in guidance to duty. Hence the importance to every Christian of looking at the whole circle of moral truths in their just relations and bearings. Hence, too, the propriety of Paul's petition: "I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment, that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding." No Chris-

man has a right to be injudicious. He may, indeed, act indiscreetly on a sudden emergency; but with the Bible in his hands and a throne of grace to which he may resort for light, he cannot adopt a settled course of injudicious conduct innocently, because he is bound to use his reason and opportunities in such a manner that he may be "wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove." Let every professed follower of Christ, then, heed the instruction of Paul, and let him "search the Scriptures" till his whole soul shall be steeped in their heavenly influence; knowing that Christians, thus moulded and disciplined by proportional views of truth, ever have been and ever will be, the champions of the church; and such alone will constitute the glory of the millennial day.

Another consideration that should stimulate to this earnest search of truth and severe scrutiny of opinions, is, that the predominant design of the adversary of all good at the present day, as it appears to us, is to disseminate error. This we are aware may be thought a slander on our times; and, in refutation, it may be asked, "Is not this an age of light? Is not a far nobler work now going forward than the sowing of error?" This, we rejoice to believe, is true. We even believe that the angel, having the everlasting gospel to preach, has already commenced his flight through the midst of heaven. But the devil, who, in the times of the apostles, walked about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, is likewise still in the field. The very light of salvation, as it goes forth to illuminate the nations, has aroused him to greater activity. He is by no means disposed to lose his empire as the prince of the power of the air without a struggle. He cannot hope, however, to keep the millions of our race in so profound ignorance of holy truth as he has done. What shall he do? The light will shine. This he cannot help. What is his next best policy? It must be to prevent its legitimate effects—artfully to slip in some distorting medium, through which the rays of truth shall fall upon the retina of the mind without impressing a distinct image, so that his victims may be bewildered with false appearances, and imagine that they are following "the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," while in fact they are following the flickering flame of their own fancies. The grand object of the devil is to frustrate

the redemptive scheme of Christ; and he would as lief do this by error as by ignorance. Consequently, the activity of the church by no means discourages him, or paralyses his sleepless energies. His efforts to destroy are always in proportion to the efforts of the former to save. When baffled in one expedient, he devises another, dexterously changing his mode of attack to meet the emergency of the moment, never tiring, and he never will, till he is chained. Hence, in this day of illumination, the world abounds with delusions. Their number is, indeed, legion; and they spread over the land like the flies of Egypt. Even the sun of truth, as it rises towards the meridian, seems to warm them into being. They are propagated in ways the most stealthy, and in forms the most specious; seldom so gross as to shock the taste of the refined; not always great, yet just enough to poison and destroy; if not enough to destroy, yet enough to hinder the upward course of the believer. Sometimes error is insinuated in the gay and bewitching attire of poetry, and breathed forth in her mellowest music; sometimes interwoven in the graceful periods and fine sentiments of the novel and romance; now pointed by a dash of fancy or stroke of irony; again scintillating in sparkles of wit; at one time clad in the garb of philosophy she walks forth with stately mien, challenging the admiration of the intellectual, showing herself in harmony with the laws of the universe,—as the offspring of that perfect symmetry which obedience to their dictates engenders, and thus exalting herself into relationship to some of the loftiest sentiments and conceptions of the human mind; and at another, exhibiting herself in grosser forms adapted to the apprehension of the less cultivated, and offering incense to the baser passions; now appearing with the open and beaming countenance of benevolence, and wearing the motto “Reform,” and then with the dark, scowling brow of malignity, uttering contempt and scorn. Sometimes error is made even to worm itself into the pale of the church, endeavoring, first, by throwing her off her guard, to relax her grasp from the main pillars, knowing that indifference to truth is the next door to delusion; and graciously whispering that there is not danger of heresies now as in olden times, when the general mind was less enlightened: that though it might have been well enough then to “contend

earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," these times have passed; even artfully suggesting, and with an air of truth, that such a course would do injury at the present period of progress; that what the church now specially needs is peace, earnest coöperation; and that the infusing of the great, discriminating truths of the gospel would only set brethren at variance; and therefore, though believed, they should be veiled from open view. In the minds of some, she invests the term doctrine, used relatively to the gospel, with a sort of terror, as though it were a kind of monster, which, in times gone by, had prowled into the inclosure of the church, filling it with strife and blood;—an object as appalling to their imaginations as Samuel's ghost to the witch of Endor, and must at all hazard be debarred entrance in future; while she induces the feeling in others, that the doctrines of the gospel are only worthy of a sneer, and doctrinal preaching, if not the height of the ridiculous, yet is extremely old-fashioned, and a theme fit for every ungracious remark. And at other times, she breaks out with the bold inquiry, "what have we, in this refined and enlightened age, to do with the doctrines?" And well might wisdom retort, "what has a knowing age to do with accurate and scientific knowledge?" for the doctrines of the Bible are but the science of the Bible, and accurate knowledge of them is but accurate or scientific knowledge of sacred truth. Surely, what have we to do, in this learned age, with accurate and thorough views of the fundamental truths of our holy religion,—truths which are to decide our weal or woe for immortality?

But perhaps the master-stroke of the devil in the line of error is to insinuate the suspicion that he himself does not exist, and that the idea of his temptations is but a spectral bugbear of the dark ages; so that he may spread his snares in every one's path without suspicion.

Thus the arch-fiend is disseminating error by a thousand wiles. This should put all of us on our guard, for who is not exposed to his machinations? He well understands the art of deluding men; his toil and experience of 6,000 years have not wearied him; on the contrary, they have taught him every avenue to the human heart, and encouraged him in his efforts. He who knew how to touch the weak point

in Eve's character, surely knows how to touch the weak point in ours; and with all his skill, both native and acquired, we may be certain that he is still a lion roaring after his prey. But on the other hand, have we not learned something of his craft, and should we not avail ourselves of this knowledge? We should watch narrowly every entrance to the mind. We should look beyond the polished exterior into the heart of opinions and enterprises as they rise on the theatre of action and reform. We should not be suspicious of those who differ from us; our mantle of charity should be wide; we should not be incredulous of the new and strange; but we should see for ourselves, knowing that the devil is fruitful in novelties. We should not be, in an odious sense, heresy hunters; yet we should be cautious, wise. Why should we be befooled by him who has already befooled his thousands? Why should we not learn Satan's devices, against which we have been long divinely warned? Why should we not look through and through every subject upon which we are called to form an opinion, before settling down upon our conclusions? True, we should be candid; but candor has a keen eye and a searching glance; even charity is said not to be blindfold. The truth is, our age peculiarly demands self-knowledge. *We must know ourselves*; and be sure that we are not under the fascinations of our own hearts, and of Satan's delusions. We must search diligently and thoroughly for the foundations, for "if the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?"

In conclusion we would remark, truth *must be wrought into active principles*. Merely to believe that there is a God, that He is our Governor, that we are sinners, that there is a hell, that Christ is an Almighty Saviour, and that repentance and faith are indispensable requisites to salvation, is not enough. Most would be ashamed to disavow a belief in these cardinal doctrines; and therefore many seem to be satisfied with a mere intellectual assent to truths so important. But these and other revealed truths, in order to avail to salvation, must not only be received into the head, but must burn on the heart. If there is a God, he must be feared and obeyed; if there is an Almighty Saviour, he must be trusted; if we are sinners, we must repent; if there is a hell, we must flee from the wrath to come. One may know that industry,

economy, prudence, and care, are essential to prosperity in worldly affairs; but if he neglect these practical principles, is idle, wasteful, indiscreet and careless, his estate will be ruined. So it is in spiritual concerns. If gospel truths are not acted upon, the soul will be ruined. Knowledge without corresponding action is folly. They who have a knowledge of Divine truth, and practise it not, are in the Scriptures denominated fools. We fear that many are such. We fear that many treasure up religious knowledge, heap up mass after mass in the chambers of the intellect, while it has little influence on their conduct. Their knowledge of spiritual truth is useless as the miser's gold; and, therefore, in the end they will be found to have treasured up wrath against the day of wrath. How fearfully unwise! Oh let us remember that truth *must be improved*. It must be written in characters of fire on the heart. It must come out in action. The end of all moral truth is the activity of moral beings. Of what avail to style ourselves Protestants, and to profess to make the Bible our only rule, unless we are living exemplifications of its holy doctrines and precepts? Would that we, who are so zealous in our opposition to the Romanists, were more zealous to be clothed ourselves with humility;—to wear, indeed, all the truths of the Bible as our daily attire! Alas! how many know their Master's will, but have no disposition to do it; and will, therefore, be justly condemned, will for ever wade through the fiery gulf, for ever hear the upbraiding accents,

“Ye knew your duty, but ye did it not.”

ART. IV.—TENDENCIES OF THE TIMES.

ONE of the most conspicuous peculiarities of the age, is the projection and pursuit of schemes for the cure of the social and moral evils that prevail. There is a general feeling, not only that reformatations are needed, but that they are practicable; and plans are accordingly devised to educate the ignorant, to restrain and correct the lawless, to raise the degraded from debasement, and especially to communicate

the blessings of religion to those who are destitute of them, and spread refinement, virtue, and enjoyment, through the whole community : and many are led by the efforts that are made to carry out these plans, and the success that seems to attend them, to entertain the belief that a rapid improvement in the character of the population is taking place, and that ere long a far purer religion and a higher measure of happiness than has hitherto been known, will generally prevail. Much is certainly done to stem the tide of immorality and irreligion that swells on every hand, and the indications of the future are incomparably more favorable than they would be, were the efforts that are made to spread the blessings of the gospel discontinued. Yet those who indulge in these expectations of a speedy renovation of society, seriously impose on themselves, we think, by looking too exclusively to the good that is apparently accomplished, and not to the sin and misery that continue unreached ; and still more, perhaps, by framing their views of a perfect society by an inadequate standard. There are not a few who seem to take their own families, churches, or neighborhoods, as exemplifications of all that religion is ever to accomplish for mankind ; and were the whole nation raised to that range of cultivation, orderliness, and piety, it would equal their beau-ideal of the millennial age ; while there are others who appear to form their notions of the character and condition of the irreligious and miserable generally by what lies within their sphere of observation, where the restraints of education, law, and religion, are felt ; and overlook the deeper degradation, the fiercer passions, the more appalling crimes and miseries that exist in the vast circles beyond. Were they, on the one hand, raised to a just perception of what the love, faith, sanctitude, and wisdom are which the gospel enjoins, and to which the children of God are to be exalted when the knowledge of Him shall fill the earth as the waters cover the seas ; and on the other, had they a clear view of the condition of the crowd around them ; were they to catch a glimpse of the utter alienation from God, the malignant affections, the terrible crimes, the hideous degradation, the frightful miseries of a great city for example like this, the good that exists would shrink from the vast dimensions they ascribe to it ; and the redemption of the world, instead of

being about to be completed, appear scarcely begun, and impossible without an immeasurably more efficient interposition of the Almighty. If, as many maintain, the world is on the point of a vast reformation; if the nations especially that are civilized are on the verge of a general conversion; if the efforts that are now making by the church to carry the gospel to every tribe and every individual, are soon to be crowned with success, and all false beliefs, false worships, indifference, and hostility, vanish from the earth, and be succeeded by universal faith and holiness; the indications of that happy change ought especially to be visible and conspicuous here, where the gospel is to such an extent already known, and where exertions are made on so large a scale to communicate its blessings to all who are yet destitute of them. The streaks of the dawning millennium ought to shoot up the horizon here, earlier and with a brighter glow than anywhere else. What then is in fact the religious condition of this great people, enjoying the gifts of the gospel in a higher measure than any other, and possessed perhaps more generally than any other with the idea of an approaching moral and religious reformation? What is the state of the general mind? What are the tendencies of the church? What likelihoods are there that the number of true worshippers is now to increase far more rapidly in proportion to the population at large than heretofore? What signs are there that atheism and infidelity, the perversion of the gospel, the rejection of its great doctrines, unbelief, fraud, falsehood, worldliness, sensuality, and sin in all its forms, are dying out; and faith, love, rectitude, benevolence, and obedience generally to the divine law taking their place?

We see not how any one who looks impartially at the character of the church and nation, and the direction in which they are moving, can persuade himself that there are any indications of such a change, or that the prospect is not rather of a relative decline of true religion, and a rapid growth of the parties and influences that are in antagonism with it.

In the first place, the nation was never more thoroughly pervaded through all its ranks by a spirit of worldliness; an eager desire of wealth; a love of gay and irreligious pleasures; and a passion for conspicuity and power, than at

present. The passions that find their gratification in those forms, are raised to an unusual energy of excitement, and are impressing their character in a very emphatic manner, especially on the active and rising generation. There is a general and violent rush for wealth. Vast crowds at least no longer limit their views to a respectable competence, but regard riches as essential to their happiness; and struggle for them as vehemently as for subsistence itself. Nor is this passion for a great fortune confined to the irreligious, but reigns as conspicuously almost in the church as among the worldly, and is scarcely thought to be any more unsuitable in the one than in the other. If a small share of his hoard is devoted to benevolent and religious objects, a zealous worshipper of mammon may, notwithstanding his devotion to that deity, enjoy the reputation of a generous and liberal disciple of Jesus.

This hungry and grasping worldliness, however, is one of the most indubitable signs of the absence of religion. That passionate and sordid love, is an idolatry that cannot consist with the love of God. Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also. If any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him.

Now are there any indications that this eager pursuit of wealth, of power, and of pleasure, is likely soon to be abandoned? Are there any signs that a great change in the popular estimate of them is about to take place?—that their ardent devotees are on the point of relinquishing them, becoming humble, self-denying, and spiritual, and turning to seek that inheritance that is undefiled and eternal in the heavens? Can a change more entirely against all appearances be imagined? Can a revolution more wholly out of the circle of probabilities be conceived than that they should speedily, under the promptings of the religious influences that are now exerted on them, renounce these pursuits which so absorb them, and become as distinguished for a just estimate of the treasures of this life, as they now are for their excessive love of them? No one will pretend it. All the tendencies are in the opposite direction. Nothing can be more certain than that this determination to be rich, and to live in luxury and fashion, by which so many fall into foolish and hurtful lusts that drown them in destruction and

perdition, is likely to continue and reign in the generation that is about to enter on the bustle of life, as absolutely as in those who are now absorbed in the strife, and to keep alive and nourish the brood of malignant passions and fraudulent arts that have ever formed its train. What more emphatic token is there that they are not to be temples of the Spirit of God?—that they are not to enjoy his presence?

In the next place, there never were worse principles avowed by great numbers than at present, nor more decisive evidences of their unchecked predominance given in irreligious lives, and debasing and enormous crimes. The crowd of open and contemptuous rejectors of Christianity was never greater than at present. Nor were bolder endeavors ever made to give a general prevalence to positive irreligion. The enemies of the gospel do not any longer retreat from the public eye, or veil their hostility under feigned professions of respect. They are undisguised in the avowal of their rejection of it and of God, and in their assertion of their right to make their own laws, and seek their supreme good in whatever pleasures their passions prompt them to pursue, and the means within their reach enable them to enjoy. Nor did lawless principles ever reign in a greater number of breasts and give birth more frequently to violent and atrocious crimes. The papers are daily filled with recitals of thefts, brawls, outrages, and murders. The police of the great cities has become inadequate to the protection of property and life. The multitude who thus either openly renounce the authority of the Most High, or in effect make themselves their law, was never greater than at present.

What likelihood now is there that this vast crowd—many of whom, having had their birth abroad, have been nurtured in the worst forms of atheism, and trained to the indulgence of the most debasing appetites and passions—are about to be arrested in this career of sin, and become the rapt adorers of Jehovah?—the spotless followers of the Lamb? Are any signals of such a change seen in their principles or habits? Do any of the influences that now reach them promise to work so stupendous a revolution? Are there any schemes of agency projecting by the church that will be more likely than those employed heretofore to

prove the means of their reformation? Surely no one will pretend it. The indications are altogether in the opposite direction. The evil immeasurably transcends the counteractive powers that are as yet arrayed against it; and is likely, in place of declining, to grow in strength and gain a wider sway.

In the third place, there were never more powerful agencies employed for the propagation of error and irreligion. Atheism, infidelity, and all the false forms of Christianity have now regular organizations for their support and diffusion. Each has a party who unite in avowing and advocating it, and each party employs the press and the living teacher, and makes systematic efforts to spread the knowledge of its principles, and gather proselytes. Large funds are devoted to the circulation especially of tracts, periodicals, and books, in which the great truths of Christianity are assailed and traduced, and atheism and infidelity taught in the most subtle and imposing forms. Universalists, also, those who hold that the impenitent are to be exempted from punishment by annihilation; the deniers of Christ's divinity and atonement; Swedenborgians, the disciples of modern pantheism, the deniers of the Spirit's influences; Puseyites, Catholics, Mormons, and other errorists, are as active and zealous as the friends of truth in the diffusion of their doctrines, and make as large appropriations for the purpose probably of their property. There is not a solitary class of false believers, no matter how daring and mischievous their sentiments are, who deem it their policy to conceal their light under a bushel. They all stand forth in the open day, proclaim their doctrines, claim for them the sanction of reason or revelation, and employ such enginery as they can command, to give them a general currency. The number of preachers, lecturers, and teachers of these several classes who are engaged in inculcating their doctrines is very great; the array of tracts, periodicals, and books issued by them exceeds a hundred, and not improbably a thousand fold, the publications that are circulated for the purpose of counteracting them, and the multitudes whom they reach and influence are immense.

What symptoms now are there that these powerful parties who are thus engaged in warring against the truth and propagating fatal error, are suddenly to be arrested in their career

of propagandism, and sink into inactivity, or turn to the reception and inculcation of the gospel which they now reject? Are there any indications that their zeal has begun to flag, that they have become distrustful of their peculiar sentiments, or that the public are no longer disposed to listen to their teachings? Was there ever a period before when they appeared in such strength, made more strenuous efforts to accomplish their ends, or met with more signal success? Has there been a time when it was more apparent than it now is, that those who hold the truth are not likely to oppose any efficient counteractives to their influence? No one will be so absurd as to pretend it.

Another favorite method at the present day, of giving notoriety to doctrines and promoting their diffusion, is to hold conventions to discuss them and devise and institute measures for their dissemination. Almost all parties, no matter how senseless, how factious, or how irreligious they are, have an annual meeting of their representatives to debate their principles, perfect their organization, and extend their agency. This is an adroit expedient to catch the public eye, raise themselves into conspicuity, and invest their doctrines with a species of official authority. As their transactions are reported in the public papers, the knowledge of their principles and aims is transmitted to thousands who would otherwise never hear of them. No contrivance could be devised more happily adapted to gratify the vanity of ambitious leaders, and inflame the hopes and zeal of aspiring demagogues, who have no other theatre for the display of their powers, and no other method of gathering a crowd to the spectacle. Nine tenths of those who figure in these self-constituted assemblies, whether infidels, Fourierites, ultra abolitionists, advocates of women's rights, agrarianists, liberty partisans, Mormons, mesmerizers, or demon-questioners, would never succeed in making their names known beyond their own neighborhoods were it not that they may thus once a year present themselves in a sort of official character to the public gaze.

Are any signs seen that these restless and aspiring beings are growing weary of this charming game? Are any symptoms betrayed by them of a disposition to forego so rare a means of advancing their ambition and gratifying

their vanity? Is there any likelihood that they will shrink back into their natural obscurity as long as they can find partisans to give them conspicuity, or induce the public papers to herald to the world their transactions?

In the fourth place, there are other powerful agents at work that exert a depraving influence on the taste, the principles, and the morals of great multitudes. Among these, one of the most efficient is the fashionable literature of the day, a large share of which is not merely without merit, but is directly irreligious and corrupting. Not a few of the popular novels are made the vehicles of propagating the most false and infidel doctrines, giving fascination to vice, and exhibiting the grossest enormities against God and man, as mere misfortunes, pardonable weaknesses, or brilliant foibles, rather than atrocious crimes. The bulk of those works are written to meet the taste of readers, not to refine and elevate it. The great question with their authors is, what will sell? What will meet the quickest and most impassioned response from the greatest number of readers? And the meaning of that is:—what will give the widest play to a wild fancy; what will best rouse a lawless curiosity, and transport the reader to scenes where he may revel in all the forms of pleasure without restraint? And each endeavoring to transcend the others in novelty and extravagance, not merely meets, but inflames and exacerbates the passions which he aims to gratify. The circulation which these depraving books obtain is immense. They far outstrip all others, and have a principal influence in moulding the taste, determining the principles, and forming the character of great numbers of the young.

Besides these, there are other books, especially such as treat of metaphysics, that are expressly designed to sap the foundations of religion, and exert a powerful influence in that direction. The works of Coleridge, Kant, Schleiermacher, Cousin, and others of that school, have been the means of unsettling the belief of multitudes in the truth of revelation and the being of God, and leading them into a wild and daring scepticism. And they have been, and still are in a measure, the fashionable writers. Both the secular and religious press teemed for fifteen or twenty years with extravagant eulogies of Coleridge as the greatest of Chris-

tian philosophers, who not only rejects the inspiration of the Scriptures and sets aside all the great doctrines of redemption, but denies the being itself of God, and of the universe, except as ideas, and makes it his great aim to strike them for ever from the faith of men; and misled by those commendations and the artful disguises under which he veils his atheism, crowds of those who were educated during that period, have taken him as their guide.

The literary and scientific lectures that are delivered in lyceums and addressed to popular assemblies in the cities, are often made the vehicle of disseminating doctrines and opinions that are subversive of religion and morals. That is a favorite method with the advocates of Agrarianism, Fourierism, Socialism, Idealism, Pantheism, and other lawless and infidel systems, of giving their theories a learned and dignified air, and insinuating them without suspicion into the minds of the young.

A large share of the fashionable amusements of the great cities are also highly corrupting, while the countless shops at which the means of intoxication are sold, are centres from which depravation, debasement, and destruction are diffused on an almost boundless scale.

What indications are there now that these powerful instruments of evil are about to drop from the hands of those who wield them, and the vast crowds whom they pervert and debase pass under the sway of better influences? Are there any appearances that the taste for such books, such doctrines, and such pleasures has become satiated? Was there ever a larger demand for them than at present? Was there ever less likelihood of their becoming unfashionable, and giving place to works—of equal interest to the multitude—of refined taste and virtuous principles? What change more wholly improbable can be imagined?

In the fifth place, there never was a period when a greater facility was manifested by multitudes of delusion in religious affairs, and the most preposterous and shameful deceptions found adroit and ardent propagandists, and met a crowd of ready and zealous dupes. No matter what doctrine is advanced, it finds listeners, believers, and partisans: no matter what project is proposed in the name of philanthropy or religion, a crowd is found ready to accept it, and give it

their sanction and support. A more palpable and clumsy fraud was scarce ever attempted to be palmed upon the credulous than that of the Mormon revelation, and the inspiration of its expositors; yet the profligate doctrines and schemes of the prophet who invented it met a prompt response from the debased affections and lawless passions of many of the ignorant, the idle, and the scheming; and the party has risen to numbers, wealth, and power, and is likely soon to form a State in which its atrocious principles and practices will not improbably enjoy the sanction of public law.

They have exhibited a scarcely less astonishing delusion, who, within a few years, have taught and embraced the doctrine in many of the churches, that regeneration involves nothing more than forming a resolution or purpose to be religious, or seek to obtain salvation on the mere ground of interest—a selfish regard to happiness, or desire to enjoy the greatest possible sum of gratification:—the precise motive in kind that prompts to sin, and that would for ever prompt those who are under its dominion to go on in sin, could they but escape the punishment that rebellion draws after it. Yet this wretched solecism, which is at war with the divine law, denies the distinction between moral good and evil, and contradicts the consciousness universally of the pious; which exhibits repentance, love, and faith, as unnecessary and impossible, and makes the profession of supreme love to God an act of hypocrisy, and submission to him, trust in him, and obedience to his commands, but selfish expedients to secure the gifts he bestows; this miserable caricature of the homage God demands and his true worshippers render him, has been mistaken by a vast crowd for the religion of the Bible; and thousands and tens of thousands, impelled by their infatuated guides, have actually entered the church, in the persuasion that by the momentary direction of such selfish desires and resolutions to the blessings of an immortal life, they were transformed into the spotless image of him who created them! Nor have the young and ignorant only been thus deluded; but great numbers also of the mature and cultivated. Its most undoubting and enthusiastic disciples and propagators, indeed, have been ministers of the gospel, who had received a theological education, who had studied not only those por-

tions of the Bible, but the treatises of Owen, Baxter, Edwards, Bellamy, and others, that distinguish the characteristics of the renewed from those of the unrenewed mind ; and had themselves held and taught the doctrines of the evangelical system ; and some of whom have—with a confused idea, doubtless, that they were not inconsistent—continued to profess their adherence to those doctrines. Did men of intelligence, of experience, and of reflection, ever before on so plain and momentous a question, impose on themselves and a large share of the community in so extraordinary a manner ? Was there ever a more sad exhibition of the facility with which those enjoying eminent means of knowledge, may be betrayed into the most palpable and fatal mistakes, and precipitate the crowds to destruction, whom they persuade themselves they are guiding to heaven ?

But the vagueness of the religious beliefs of many, and the facility with which they may be led into the gravest errors and superstitions, is exemplified in the most striking manner by the rapid spread of the delusion of the spirit-questioners ; and the large number of educated and professedly religious persons who have given it their sanction. No attempt to impose on the ignorance and credulity of men ; no device for making merchandise of their religious curiosity, doubts, and fears respecting the future life, ever before met in this country such success. Though great numbers, doubtless, who have joined the crowd of inquirers and spectators have had no faith in the cheat, yet multitudes have been duped into the full belief that the effects which they witnessed were the work of disembodied spirits, and that the responses that were given, were communicated by them. The originators of the shameless quackery are undoubtedly at this moment exerting a greater influence than any hundred ministers of the gospel. Their disciples, scattered throughout the whole country, constitute a large body, and comprise not only the ignorant, the sceptical, the superstitious, and the profligate, but many of better classes, and even of the learned professions.

This is, undoubtedly, the most extraordinary infatuation that has ever gained so sudden and wide a prevalence ; as it is not supported by any evidence, it is against the laws of nature, and it is utterly incredible from its worthlessness and

senselessness. If all the alleged physical facts are admitted, there still is no proof that they are the work of disembodied spirits. The only voucher for that is the testimony of the operators. But their witness is not to be taken; and from the nature of the case, if the facts were really the work of spirits—as the spirits are not perceptible by the senses—they could no more be cognisant of it than any other spectators. It is against the demonology of the Bible, which is the only source we have of information respecting the power of departed spirits to act on material bodies. The demons of the New Testament never acted on material objects except through the organs of the demoniacs whom they possessed. There is not the slightest indication that they had an independent power of wielding or moving material bodies, or exerting any agency on them. It is infinitely incredible, indeed, that they could. As they have no bones and muscles, or other organized members which they can use as levers to lift and move bodies, it is physically impossible that they should produce such effects, unless it were by a mere volition. But that would imply omnipotence; and the omnipotence by which the bodies in which the effects were wrought, were created and upheld; for in order that a being might be able, by a mere volition, to produce an effect in a body with which he had no material connexion, it would obviously be necessary that that body should be wholly dependent for its condition on his will. If it were not, but owed its existence and condition to the will of another, his will plainly could have no influence over it. It is a solecism, therefore, to suppose that a material body could be absolutely dependent for its condition on any other being, than he who created and upholds it. It is the prerogative then of the omnipotence alone that creates and sustains material things, to produce a change in their nature or position by a mere volition. To ascribe such a power to demons, is, therefore, to suppose them the creators and upholders of the objects they are said to affect.

But the whole affair is shown to be a clumsy and impudent trick, by the worthlessness and senselessness of the communications which the operators profess to have received from the demon oracles. There is not one of them, so far as we have observed, which it would not be a discredit to the

sense of even the meanest of the lost, to come to this world to announce, and announce *through such mediums*. Yet notwithstanding these palpable marks of the falsehood and impiety of the pretence, it has met the ready credence of a vast crowd, and gained so absolute a sway over many as to drive them to infatuation and madness.

There are many other errors also prevailing extensively, that bespeak a singular readiness of persons of all ranks to be led away from the truth, and involved in wild and fatal delusions.

What appearances now are there, that this extraordinary facility of deception and apostasy to the most false, superstitious, and impious beliefs, is suddenly to die out and give place to good sense, watchfulness, wisdom, and an inflexible attachment to the truth? Are any gleams seen of a dawning millennium in the extreme darkness of mind, the utter disregard of the gospel, and the daring impiety which crowds thus exhibit? Are there any indications that they are about to turn from their false beliefs, reject their delusions, and become the intelligent, the pure, and the faithful disciples of the Redeemer? Is any change further from their thoughts, and more entirely against probabilities?

And, finally, errors and delusions are not confined to those mainly who are not professedly religious; they prevail in the church also, and on a greater scale, probably, than at any former period. Instead of standing wholly on the side of truth, and exerting by its principles, its teachings, and its example, only a salutary influence; it is itself the seat, in some of its branches, of gross apostasy; while those of its denominations that probably embrace the greatest number of true worshippers, are divided into parties that differ essentially in their views of the doctrines of redemption, and are laboring as strenuously in one of their divisions to disseminate errors that subvert the gospel, as they are in the other to inculcate and maintain the truth. Thus within a few years, a large party has risen in the Congregational body, who, adopting the metaphysical theory of a self-determined will, deny on the ground of it, the power of God to prevent his creatures from sinning, or restore those who are fallen to holiness by his Spirit; and thence deny, doubt, or neglect, all the great doctrines of his

word with which that dogma conflicts; and that error has found many disciples and favorers also in other denominations. At the same time another party, in a measure from pursuing those speculations to their natural results, and still more from adopting other elements of the modern German metaphysics, and the rationalistic theory of interpretation, has arisen, that not only rejects the great doctrines of the gospel, but gives up its faith in the Bible itself as an inspired revelation from God, and holds it to be of little higher authority than other didactic and historical works that have descended to us from the sages and philosophers of ancient times. These disciples of the German theological infidelity, some of whom are deeply tinged with material, and some with spiritual pantheism, instead of a small body, are, if we may rely on the representations of persons who have the best opportunities of knowledge, quite numerous; and it is indicated by the extensive acquiescence and support the doctrines of the leaders of the party are receiving from the ministers and churches. In the meantime, in the Episcopal and German Reformed churches, parties have risen who openly favor the doctrines of Romanism, exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures, rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart, and on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings.

While these or other equal defections from the truth have taken place in the principal denominations, the great doctrines of the gospel have, in a measure, fallen into neglect among those who have not rejected them. Instead of being taught with the frequency and distinctness they were thirty years ago, they are scarcely preached at all in many of the churches, and when made the theme of discourse, it is often but indirectly and under the veil of vague and general terms; and so greatly have the views of ministers and the feelings of churches changed on the subject, that the rejection of Christ's deity and expiation, the renewing influences of the Spirit, justification by faith, and other essential doctrines of the gospel, is by multitudes no longer considered as a disqualification for the sacred office, or a justifiable ground for ecclesiastical discipline. And these errors, it should be considered, had their origin, not with private and isolated

individuals, but in the theological seminaries, and have been spread from them, and are accordingly held mainly by those who are teachers of the churches, and whose office it is to form the religious views and sentiments of their people.

What signs, now, are there in this condition of the churches, that the millennial day is about to dawn in unclouded effulgence? What grounds are there for the belief that those who are now strenuously maintaining these errors, are about to lose their faith in them, and discontinue their inculcation? What is there in their principles and passions, or the dispositions of the population, to justify the expectation that they will not go on in the propagation of their mistaken views; that other false teachers will not arise and inculcate other errors; and that the condition of the churches will not grow worse instead of better?

From this brief sketch, then, of the state of the church and nation at the present time—which, in place of being overdrawn, the impartial, we doubt not, will feel is given in too faint colors for the reality—it is apparent that the persuasion that extensively prevails; and which great efforts are made to sustain and propagate, that religion is rapidly advancing among us; that a vast reformation is in progress: that the sun of the millennium is flashing its first streaks up the eastern sky, and is soon to shed forth its full effulgence, chase away the darkness and error of the nation, and invest them with the grace and beauty of pure worshippers; is wholly without authority, and nothing less than a consummate delusion. All the indications are in the opposite direction, and so manifestly, as to make it a matter of surprise that any fail to see it. The church was never in a more critical state. Instead of being on the point of a final victory, it is about to struggle for its existence, against powerful hosts that environ it, and traitors that have possession of some of its principal citadels.

It will, perhaps, be said: Admitting that the prospect of a speedy conversion of the whole nation is not so promising as many of the sanguine represent; yet, the great efforts that are making for the education of ministers, the establishment of churches, and the spread of sacred knowledge, justify the belief that religion is to advance with rapid strides and extend its sway over a larger proportion of the nation.

This, we apprehend, is an equal mistake. Within twenty-one or two years, if no great calamity occurs to check their increase, the population will probably amount to fifty millions, requiring twice as many churches and twice as many ministers as there now are to preserve the same proportion to the numbers to be instructed. What probability is there that a multiplication will take place in that time that is so much beyond the ratio of advance in any former period? Suppose, however, it should take place, what likelihood is there that the new churches and teachers are, as a body, to be any more evangelical than the present? Those entering the ministry during that period, are, doubtless, in the main to be educated at the present theological seminaries, in several of which the false doctrines are taught into which so many have already been betrayed. What reason is there to suppose that those doctrines will not continue to be taught in them, and find as large a proportion of disciples as they have heretofore? What certainty is there that other seminaries may not apostatize, or that some of those that may hereafter be established, will not become the fountains of error, and instead of auxiliaries, prove the means of debasing and corrupting the church?

But it will, perhaps, be said, that great as the evils are that now prevail, there are powerful counteractives to them in the faith, the zeal, the fidelity of the true people of God, and especially in the great associations that are engaged in the communication of the gospel to the destitute here, and to the heathen. But we answer, if they are to arrest this tide of error and preserve the church from further apostasy or decline, why is it that they have thus far given no proofs that they are to produce that effect? It was during the period of their most prosperous career that the great departures to which we have referred of the church from the faith, took place. Besides, what certainty have we that these societies themselves may not pass into the hands of those who reject the great doctrines of the gospel, and be perverted to the spread of their false systems instead of the truth? Are there not already some among their conspicuous advocates and leaders who have spent a large part of their lives in the propagation of the most unscriptural doctrines that have gained a prevalence in the church?

Who can say that the number of such is not to increase? These societies will naturally have the character, in the main, of the churches that sustain them. If a large majority of those churches entertain a false faith, they will naturally select men of their own views to conduct their religious institutions, and make them the vehicle of disseminating their own doctrines; not those which they reject.

It will, perhaps, be said, that although the state of the church here is in many respects discouraging, yet the extraordinary progress of evangelical missions in heathen lands indicates the dawn of a new era, and justifies the expectation that the millennium when all nations are to be converted, is rapidly approaching. The success, we reply, of the missions from this country and Great Britain, if less than many have anticipated, is as great as could reasonably be expected, and demands the grateful acknowledgments of God's people; yet it is far from being certain that what has been gained there is more than a counterbalance to what has been lost at home. Great defections have taken place among the clergy of the Protestant churches on the continent of Europe, in Great Britain, and in this country during the last thirty years. Who can persuade himself that the apostates do not far exceed the number of evangelical missionaries that are now laboring among the heathen? Those false teachers have drawn after them from their churches and congregations, a vast crowd of followers. Is there any likelihood that in the churches established among the heathen, there is an equal body of converts; or one half or one third the number? If much has been gained abroad then, at least as much, and probably much more, has been lost at home. So that taking the world at large, truth and piety, instead of advancing, are on the decline, or at best, have in their progress only kept pace with the rapid spread of error and irreligion. This, had we space, we might confirm by the extraordinary resuscitation of the Catholic church within a few years, its closer alliance with the arbitrary governments of the European continent, and the revival in each of a disposition to persecute the true worshippers, and repress and extinguish the spirit of religious and civil freedom.

There is no such rapid spread of religion then, as many allow themselves to believe; nor any signs in the piety of

the church, that the dawn of the millennium has begun, or is at hand. So far from it, that persuasion itself is a proof of the reverse; cherished as it is, against the most palpable facts, and the plain teachings of the divine word; as it indicates that the church in which it is fostered, instead of having emerged from the darkness of error and unbelief, is involved in a deep delusion respecting its own character and condition, and the great purposes of God.

The emphatic signals of the near approach of the great hour of the world's redemption, are of precisely the opposite kind; the wide-spreading decline of true religion, the extensive substitution in the church of philosophy for theology, the large prevalence of false doctrines, the sudden rise and astonishing diffusion of the grossest apostasies, and, finally, the reviving strength and threatening attitude of the anti-christian powers; for these and the extraordinary delusions and unexampled impiety that abound in the world, we are forewarned in the Scriptures, are to be the precursors of Christ's interposition to rescue the earth from his foes, and make it the habitation of righteousness and peace. And whoever will impartially look at the facts, will see that these prognostics of his coming exist, and on a scale that has not been equalled at any former period.

ART. V.—CRITICS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

I.

ANSWERS TO THE OBJECTIONS OF GEOLOGISTS.

DEAR SIR:—It has been our intention, in the course of the discussions on the subject, to give, as you wish, a more particular notice than we have hitherto done of the pleas on which geologists and their advocates rely to justify their theory of the age of the world, and of the objections they urge to those who dissent from their speculations. Some of these topics may be most advantageously considered in the reviews which we propose of several of the popular treatises

on the subject, and in answer to criticisms, should any be offered, to the views we have advanced. Some of them, however, may be properly treated independently of such occasions, and we shall accordingly in this, and perhaps in other letters hereafter, notice a portion of those to which you refer, and point out the way in which they are to be met.

1. You remark that among those whose works you have read and with whom you have conversed, who teach geology, or advocate the current theory respecting the antiquity of the earth, there is a class who treat the intimation that their speculations on the subject are mistaken with impatience and scorn. They are indignant, you say, at the suggestion that they are in error: they speak of geology as an established science; declaim on the splendid advances it has made; and represent it as demonstrating, by the most indisputable evidence, that the world was created at an incalculably earlier date than that which is assigned it by the Mosaic record. They enumerate the distinguished persons, especially of the clerical profession, who have given it their assent, and denounce those as no better than bigots, without learning or sense, who adhere to the teachings of the Bible respecting the time and order of the creation, and regard the geological theory as an impeachment of its inspiration. And, you ask, how these persons, who do not condescend to reason, but dogmatize and denounce, are to be met, and their pertness and insolence repressed?

That class of declaimers—we answer—so far as we have had opportunity to become acquainted with them, are of very little consideration. The superficiality, misconception, and rashness which they so scornfully ascribe to others, are, in truth, the distinguishing elements of their own character. They are not thorough geologists, nor often even among the second or third rate cultivators of the science, but generally mere smatterers. The most dogmatical, indeed, and intolerant of them whom we have chanced to know, have never so much as made it a subject of formal study. They belong to another profession, and have merely read a few volumes respecting it; and, carried away by its novelty and glare, seem to be prompted to the ostentatious display they make of their knowledge, and zealous advocacy of the doctrine of a

vast age of the world, by the belief that it is creditable to their intelligence, and gives them a rank among the friends and cultivators of science. There is scarce a surer sign, however, of a superficial acquaintance with the subject; there is hardly a more certain index of a genuine quack, than an attempt to discountenance and frown down the criticism of that theory by the haughty assumption of its truth and denunciation of those who think proper to found their opinions on facts, rather than on authorities that recoil with such singular sensibility from the light of candid and thorough investigation. Respectable geologists do not resort to such artifices to sustain their speculations. The pages of Buckland, Conybeare, Lyell, Murchison, De la Beche, Phillips, Mantell, Sedgwick, abroad, and of Silliman, Rogers, Dana, Emmons, and others of that class in our own country, are not defaced by such blustering and arrogance; nor will they thank those noisy pretenders who resort to them for their advocacy. They are accustomed to make truth the great object of their search, and to treat the topics which they discuss with intelligence and candor; and however confident they may be of the accuracy of their theory, cannot consistently be averse to its being fairly and thoroughly tried by the proper criteria. So far from it, if it can be shown to be embarrassed with fatal difficulties, if it is founded on a false basis, and at war with the most essential maxims of the science and the laws of the physical world, they are precisely the persons who must desire to be put in possession of the proofs that that is its character; and in the most direct and effective way. Why should they not? What inducement have they to continue in the belief and support of a false theory? Such a course is not compatible either with their principles or interests. Their aim is to erect a system that has its basis in fact, and that is sanctioned and verified by the laws of the chemical and mechanical forces under which the crust of the earth received its form; and their habit of careful investigation, their love of truth, their reputation, and the credit of the profession, must all unite to inspire them with the wish to free their speculations from every false element, and place them on grounds that, instead of being overturned, will be confirmed by the discoveries that shall hereafter be made, and invest them with a fresh and brighter certainty.

But those of whom you speak, who are so impatient of criticism, and disposed to treat the suggestion that their favorite theory is erroneous, are of a very different class. They are usually but half-learned, instead of proficient in the science, or if of a higher rank, a little acquaintance is usually sufficient to show at least that they have but very inadequately considered what the grounds are on which their inference of the age of the world rests, and the points on which the question respecting its truth or error turns. Ask them for the reason of their belief that the date of the creation was far earlier than that to which it is assigned by the Mosaic record; call on them to state the premise from which their inference of the vast antiquity of the world is deduced, and to show whether it is a fact or an assumption, and it will soon become apparent that those questions have not even come within the sweep of their inquiries. So far from having mastered the subject, they have never caught a glimpse of the fundamental points in the controversy. The confusion and misapprehension that reign in their minds are exemplified in the following conversation with one of them whom we shall designate G., who considers himself as an adept in the science, and has, we hear, delivered lectures on it.

G.—I am surprised, sir, that any one making any pretensions to a knowledge of the subject should undertake to maintain that the world was created only about six thousand years ago, against the proofs geologists have discovered that it had existed and been the theatre of life innumerable ages before. Those proofs are so numerous and decisive as to put it out of question with all who have any acquaintance with the principles of the science. Editor.—As you have made it a subject of careful investigation, and are so sure of the accuracy of your views, I shall have the gratification, I hope, of learning from you what those proofs are. What, then, let me ask, are the grounds on which your belief of such an immeasurable age of the earth rests? Are they facts or theories? G.—Facts, sir, not theories. You must indeed be admirably prepared to discuss the subject, if you are yet to gain a knowledge that that is their character. E.—It indeed strikes me, sir, as altogether improper to build so important a conclusion on a mere hypothesis;

yet I am not entirely certain that yours is not founded on such a basis. Allow me to ask, sir, what the particular facts are from which you deduce that inference? G.—They are the facts of the strata themselves; as no one could have failed to see, I should presume, who had read with attention any of the numerous treatises on the subject, which geologists have published. They found their belief of the long existence of the earth on the vast series of the strata, their great thickness, the elements of which they consist, and the fossils which they imbed. E.—But how, let me inquire, do those characteristics show that such immense periods as you assume must have been occupied in their formation? G.—From the long time which it must have taken to grind down the materials of which a single stratum consists, transport them into the ocean, distribute them over its bottom, and cement them into a solid mass. As a long tract of years must have been requisite to the construction of a single stratum of even moderate thickness, innumerable ages must have revolved ere the whole series could have been completed. You may see this argument stated at large by Dr. John Pye Smith and other writers of his high rank.*

* The passage to which he referred is doubtless the following :—

"The whole series of strata, from the earliest of them to the present surface of the globe, exhibits a body of evidence in favor of our doctrine. Every stratum consists of a mass of earthy matters which *once formed the substance of rocks on elevated land*; partially excepting the limestones, for a reason to be presently mentioned. Those portions of the rocks have been *separated from their parent masses, worn down, comminuted, transported often to great distances by the force of water, deposited, consolidated, elevated, and hardened*. Operations of this kind have been repeated many times, homogeneously and heterogeneously, as to the mineralogical constitution of the masses; but the thickness, the lamination, the joints and cleavage, and the imbedded remains of animal and vegetable beings, cannot be contemplated with due attention without producing *a conviction, stronger than words can express, of periods of time amazing and overwhelming to the mind*. The most prominent instances may be mentioned, and we begin with the earliest.

"The first appearance of stratification is in the rock called gneiss. This is composed of the same materials as granite, on the irregular outline of which it rests. But whereas in granite the component ingredients are not only distinct, but preserve their crystalline figure, in gneiss they are indeed perfectly distinguishable, but their edges and corners are rounded off, and their disposition in regard to each other may be called an arrangement lengthwise and leaf-like. Now this is precisely that state which would be produced by an action

E.—By your own representation then, sir, you found your conclusion in regard to the length of that period, not absolutely on the strata themselves, but on an hypothesis respecting the source whence their materials were drawn, and the agents and processes by which they were conveyed to the ocean and wrought into their present forms. G.—Aye, but it is a fact that their materials were derived from previous continents and islands of granite, and were carried down and spread over the bottom of the ocean by rivers and currents. E.—But what are your proofs that such was the fact? G.—There is no other source from which they could have been derived, and no other mode in which they could have been introduced into the waters of the ocean and deposited in their present form. E.—But that, sir, is the point that is in debate. Instead of assuming or asserting, be good enough to demonstrate it. Where, in the first place, are your proofs of the existence of those granite continents and islands? G.—That they must have existed, is

upon the granite surface, whether unaltered or somewhat disintegrated, of wearing off, removal, rolling about, diffusion in water, subsiding by its own weight, settlement at the bottom, and finally disposition by the straight direction of a current; in a word, it is that state which those materials would necessarily acquire, in the way of being worn and arranged by water working upon them, through a long space of time; also being further acted upon by the heat transmitted from below. But *how long was that portion of time*, it would be *daring to conjecture*. We know from the ordinary way of such a process, which in many cases can be observed and watched, that it would be *extremely slow*. The trituration, depositing, and permanent fixation of a *very few inches*, would be a liberal allowance for a hundred years. What, then, is the average thickness of the gneissic rocks in Scotland, Ireland, and other countries where they have been brought up to view? On account of the intervention of other rocks, they cannot be sufficiently exposed, and therefore surveys fall short of the full amount as to magnitude; but enough is exposed to demonstrate an exceedingly great thickness. Professor Phillips, one of the most cautious of geologists, says—'We believe it to exceed many thousand yards.'—*Scripture and Geology*, pp. 321-322.

His inference that "periods of time amazing and overwhelming to the mind" have passed since the creation of the earth, is thus founded entirely on his assumption that the materials of the strata "once formed the substance of rocks on elevated land," and rocks of granite, and that they were ground down, transported by rivers to the sea, and moulded into their present form by the slow process by which disintegration, transportation, and reconstruction are now taking place. Take away those gratuitous assumptions, and his deduction is left without a premise.

apparent from the strata. As the strata are their effects, they are proofs that they existed as their source or cause; just as other effects are proofs of the existence of their causes. E.—In that, sir, you assume what you are to prove, and assume what, even on your principles, is not to be granted. In order to found your conclusion of the antiquity of the earth on facts, in contradistinction from hypotheses, you must prove the existence of those supposed continents and islands, independently of the strata themselves. To assume, first from the strata, that they were formed of the detritus of such continents, and then assuming the existence of those continents, *infer* from them that the strata were formed of their detritus, is to reason in a circle, and from a gratuitous assumption, instead of building your deduction of the age of the world on a demonstrated fact. Prove the existence of your fancied continents of granite from independent evidence, before you claim for their existence the rank of an ascertained and indubitable truth, and make it the basis of so stupendous a deduction. In the next place, when you have established their existence, then prove also by independent evidence that it was from them that the materials of the strata were drawn. It will not be till you have demonstrated those points, that you can found on them an argument for the vast age of the world. G.—But I do not pretend that independently of *the strata* I can prove that such continents and islands existed, and that it was out of their ruins that the strata were built. The strata themselves are the evidence, and all the evidence we have, that those continents once existed, and have been disintegrated and transformed into the rocks that now constitute the surface of the earth. E.—But, sir, the strata themselves furnish no such evidence. All that the substances of which they consist, their arrangement, and the fossils they imbed, demonstrate is, that they have been formed by deposition from the ocean since the creation of the earth and the existence of animals and vegetables; and all that their thickness and extent prove is, that they have been formed under the influence of powerful agents. They do not prove that they were derived from pre-existing continents and islands of granite, any more than they evince that such continents and islands were built out of a pre-existing set of strata, or

are hereafter to be formed out of the present series, or establish any other proposition with which they have no logical connexion. How does the fact that the strata consist of the same substances as granite, demonstrate that the materials of which they are formed were derived from pre-existing granite continents, any more than the fact that granite consists of the same substances as the strata, proves that the granite which now exists, was formed out of pre-existing strata? Does not the one inference follow as logically as the other from its premise? Instead, therefore, of proving from the strata that the world has existed through the vast period which you assign to it, you have *assumed*, first, that they had their origin in pre-existing continents of granite; and next, that they were drawn from them by such slow processes of disintegration and transportation by streams, as are now in progress; and have made these mere hypotheses the ground of your inference of the vast period which you hold was employed in their formation. It is thus *theory*, and not fact, that is the basis of your belief of the great antiquity which you ascribe to the earth. How is it, sir, that you have not seen that it is so? G.—I confess, I never before perceived that that is the ground of the inference of the great age of the world. Dr. J. P. Smith, Dr. Hitchcock, and other writers whom I have read, have represented the strata themselves as directly demonstrating that immense periods must have passed during their construction, and I have taken it for granted that it was so: nor can I now help feeling that they are right, though I do not see how I am to prove that they are. It is certainly supposable that such granite continents as they represent, existed, and were the source of the materials of the strata. E.—Doubtless, sir, it is *supposable*, as a thousand other things are that have never been real; but simply *supposing* their existence, does not convert it into a fact. It acquires no more reality by that process than it had before, nor does their inference from it become a demonstrated fact, any more than the supposition does on which it is founded. But beyond this, their theory is embarrassed by another difficulty. In order to render the existence of those continents even properly *supposable*, they must be able to account in a satisfactory manner for their formation. Now how, let me ask, is it held that those gra-

nite continents were formed? G.—It is supposed that the materials of the globe were created in a state of “intense fusion,” and that as the heat radiated into space, and the exterior of the mass cooled, it was formed into a crust of granite, that was at first without elevations or depressions, but was afterwards raised into continents and islands with lofty mountain ranges by the ebullition of the molten ocean within. E.—Yes, sir, that is the hypothesis; but to say nothing of the total want of evidence that the earth was created in that state, and of its inconsistency with the laws of matter; how do you account, on that theory, for the continuance of ebullition in the molten mass within the covering of granite, and the evolution in it of new measures of heat and gas that could break that massy stratum, and raise one fourth or one third of it into continents and islands, supporting lofty mountain ranges? By the supposition there were no elements in the interior that could give out fresh measures of caloric or gas. As the whole was in a state of absolute fusion, there was nothing within it to carry it to a higher action in that respect. The particles must have been pushed to the maximum of their susceptibility of excitement from each other, and would have continued therefore in the identical state in which they were created, except so far as their heat passed off by conduction, and thereby either thickened their granite covering within, or else occasioned the formation of another crust beneath it. There clearly therefore could have been no ebullition of the fiery ocean within, nor fresh generation of gases, by which the granite surface would have been thrown up from its level in towering mountain ranges and extensive continents. Your fancied continents, accordingly, are not only supposititious, but their formation in the conditions you suppose is against the laws of matter. G.—It is incredible, if the theory were embarrassed by such a fatal difficulty, that it should not have been seen by some of the distinguished writers who have advocated it. E.—But, sir, you can yourself see that it is obnoxious to that objection. You will admit that a crust formed on the surface of such a molten sphere as you suppose, would have coincided with the line of the sphere, and lain on a geological level, without any elevations or depressions of any importance. G.—Yes; the granite envelope would doubt-

less have had the exact shape of the sphere itself, and formed to the eye a vast plain, without mountains or valleys, like the ocean when without waves. E.—Well, then, you must see that to break up that crust and throw vast areas of it into mountainous continents and islands, there must have been some new expansive force developed beneath it by the evolution of a fresh measure of heat, or generation of gas. G.—Yes, that I admit. Without a development of some fresh expulsive power in the molten mass, inclosed within the granite covering, there could be nothing to force it outwards, and give it an elevation of hundreds and thousands of feet above its original level. E.—Very well. Whence, then, could such a force be generated? As the whole was in a state of fusion, it must have already given out all the heat, and released all the gases that could be evolved by that condition of its particles. Its continuance in that state would only have been a continuance of its particles in the same relations to each other; that is at the same point of temperature, and the same degree of expansion. There would be nothing within it, that by itself could by possibility cause it to extend itself so as to occupy a single point more of space. When you have communicated to a quantity of water in a vessel, all the heat which the combustion of a certain amount of fuel in contact with it will impart, if you would raise it to a still higher temperature, it is necessary, is it not, that you should burn a fresh quantity of fuel in contact with it? G.—Certainly. I cannot educe a new evolution of caloric from the relics of that fuel which has already undergone combustion, and given out all the heat which its burning could evolve. E.—Very well; and no more, unless it were by some similar external agency, could a fresh evolution of heat take place in such a world as you suppose, after all its particles had once reached the maximum of fusion, and no longer had any susceptibility left of a further chemical action by which caloric could be developed, and the mass be made to expand into larger dimensions. The cases are precisely parallel. It is physically impossible, therefore, that in such a world, an elevation of a part of the crust above the general level could have taken place. The existence of your continents and islands is thus not only not a fact, but it is not even sup-

possible in consistency with the laws of matter. G.—I confess, sir, that is a difficulty of which I had never heard, nor conceived before. E.—Yes; let me, then, suggest the expediency of making yourself a little better acquainted with the subject, before you venture to assume with such an undoubting confidence that you are right, and indulge in such intolerant and discourteous denunciations of those who refuse to assent to the crude assumptions and self-contradictory conditions of your theory.

And this you will find, we presume, a pretty fair exemplification of their knowledge of the subject, who are so resentful at the intimation that they are mistaken, and have no better method of vindicating their theory, than loudly to assert its indisputable truth, and denounce and rail at those who are so presumptuous as to believe that they see unanswerable proofs of its total error. You have but to question them a little on the difficulties of their theory, to render it apparent, that all their self-confidence and contempt of others result from their not having carried their researches far enough to see what their own theory involves, or discern what the great points are, on which the question of its truth turns.

You next refer to a class who assume that no objection to their theory can be entitled to attention, unless it comes from one who is himself a professed cultivator of geology. They treat the supposition, you say, with impatience and scorn, that any one else, no matter what his powers or attainments may be, can confute so important a doctrine of that splendid science, as they denominate it, or form any adequate estimate of the numerous and resistless evidences of its truth, with which they are familiar who are intimately acquainted with the strata. None but a *practical geologist*, they affirm, can be competent to treat the subject. It is owing altogether to their ignorance, not to their knowledge, that others undertake to discuss it. If they had only carried their inquiries far enough to form a tolerably just estimate of what the science is, they would be withheld from the folly and presumption of arraying their opinion against the long line of great men who have made its cultivation the business of their lives; and you ask what method you are to take to repress these supercilious persons, and convince them that they may be mistaken.

We answer: That objection is sometimes made by geologists of highly respectable attainments; and under the impression, doubtless, that nothing more than an acquaintance with the facts of the science is necessary to insure assent to their theory. It is usually urged, however, with the greatest confidence and indiscretion by those who have but a superficial acquaintance with the subject; and you have but to put to them a few pertinent questions, to see that the bold dashes which they employ in their portrait of others, in fact form a picture that may very justly pass for their own. Their mistake arises, as in the former instance, from their misapprehending the real ground on which their theory is founded. Let us frame a dialogue such as might very naturally take place between you, whom we shall represent as A., and G. a geologizer of that class, in which the merits of that objection will be tried.

G. Is the writer to whom you refer, who regards the theory of the great age of the world as mistaken, himself a geologist? A. No, sir, he is not. G. It is absurd then to ascribe any significance to his objections. No person can have any competence to discuss the subject who is not a practical geologist. He must have explored the strata himself; he must have ascended the mountains; he must have traversed the plains and valleys; he must have descended into the caverns and mines, and examined the rocks in their localities, analysed the substances of which they consist, studied the fossils they imbed, and made himself familiar with all their characteristics, in order to be able to judge of the vast periods that were employed in their deposition. To undertake to disprove the antiquity of the earth without this practical knowledge of the science, is as absurd as it were to attempt to confute Newton's system of astronomy without a knowledge that matter has dimensions, gravity, and motion. A. I cannot but admire, sir, the extreme modesty of your pretensions. No one, it seems, can understand the principles of the science but yourselves. If others assent to its doctrines, they must believe them wholly on your testimony, it appears; not from their comprehending the proofs by which they are sustained! A singular characteristic truly of a demonstrative science! I feel a strong curiosity to know something further of this subject. Let me

ask you to give me a definition of *practical geology*. What is the special sphere of that branch of the science—fact or theory? G. Facts, sir; and precisely those which I have been describing. A. I supposed so. It treats, I take it, of the rocks that constitute the surface of the globe; their mineral constitution, the order and connexions in which they occur, the fossils they imbed, the positions in which they lie, and the marks they bear of deposition from water, or of ejection by volcanic forces from the interior of the earth. That knowledge is acquired, therefore, by the direct inspection of the strata. It is obtained by the eye and by the hand; not by fancy or speculation. It is the knowledge of facts, of the real visible and tangible nature and condition of the strata; not of suppositions or hypotheses respecting them. Is it not so? G. Yes; that is precisely what is meant by practical geology. A. Very well; now do me the favor, if you please, to define theoretical, or speculative geology. G. Theoretical geology, instead of dealing with these facts, treats of their causes, or the modes of their production. A. Yes. It aims to show what the causes were of the strata, and the modes in which they were formed; or the sources whence their materials were drawn; the forces by which they were transported to their places of deposition; and the agents and processes to which they owe their peculiar structure and condition. G. Precisely so. You could not have given a juster definition of it. A. Very well. To which branch, now, be good enough to inform me, does your theory of the great age of the earth belong? G. It belongs to practical geology. A. To practical geology? Not at all, sir; but solely to the speculative or theoretical branch. It treats not of the strata themselves, but of the sources of their materials, and the agents and processes by which they are supposed to have been formed. It lies, therefore, altogether out of the domain of practical geology. G. I confess, sir, I had regarded it as pertaining to the practical branch of the science, instead of the speculative; but I see I misapprehended it. A. You perceive then that a knowledge of the practical part of it cannot be so indispensable as you represent to the criticism of that theory. G. But, sir, to treat the theory intelligently the critic must certainly at least know what it is, and what that is which it

respects. A. Undoubtedly; but it is not anything that lies within the sphere of that part of the science, that is denied, in denying the theory. Instead, all the facts of practical geology are admitted. That which is controverted is simply your speculative views of the source from which the materials of the strata were derived, and the causes and processes by which they were brought into their present form. You, on the contrary, have, in your objection, proceeded on the supposition that it is the facts of practical geology that are brought into question in the denial of your theory. G. I see that I have. A. It is a set of assumed facts, however; not those that are real. For your theory treats mainly—not of the strata themselves—but of a set of supposed continents, islands, and mountain ranges of granite, of which practical geology has no cognisance; and, consequently, the great points on which the question of its truth depends, are whether those imagined continents and islands of granite in reality ever existed; whether they were formed in the manner you assume; and whether the materials of which the strata are built, were drawn from them, and by the forces and processes which your theory represents. And sufficient knowledge of those points to enable one to confute that theory, undoubtedly may be gained from books and study, without the minute practical acquaintance with the strata which you represent as so indispensable; may it not? G. I suppose it may. A. On the other hand, a practical knowledge of the strata cannot prove any obstacle, as you seem to assume it must, to the rejection of your theory. It certainly does not yield it any confirmation. You do not find in the strata any traces of those fabled continents. You do not discover any masses that you can identify as once having belonged to them. You do not obtain any specimens of them. You do not see and handle their relics. G. No, sir. I make no pretences of that sort. It is by reasoning from the strata that we reach the conviction that those continents once existed, and were the sources of the materials of which the present rocks were constructed. A. How, then, is your practical geology to prove an obstacle, as you assume it must, to the rejection of your theory? Instead of confirming, it hopelessly confutes it, by evincing that there is not a solitary trace within the domains of the science of those imagined continents;

that there is not a particle of proof in the whole circle of the strata, that they ever existed. Practical geology, therefore, in place of verifying your theory, shows that it is absolutely without evidence, and devoid of all title to belief; and it is in this relation, not that which you suppose, that a practical acquaintance with the strata is important to one who attempts to criticise the theory; as it furnishes the means of showing that instead of a scientific truth, it is a mere gratuitous hypothesis. Is it not so? G. I confess, sir, the considerations you have alleged are altogether new to me, and set the subject in quite an unexpected light. I see the question belongs to theoretical rather than practical geology. I had the impression that it is the facts of practical geology that are controverted or denied in the rejection of the theory. They, I see, however, are not brought into debate; but that which is denied, is the reality of the granite continents from which the theory represents the materials of the strata as drawn, and of the processes by which they are held to have been transformed into the present strata. A. Yes; exactly so. A minute knowledge of the constitution and condition of the strata, you perceive, is not requisite to enable one to confute that theory. To spend a half dozen years in exploring the primary, secondary, and tertiary formations, cannot be necessary in order to one's showing that there are no evidences that such a granite world, as your theory assumes, ever existed. Exploring through a long period the masses of granite, gneiss, sandstone, limestone, and shale, that form the covering of the globe, cannot throw any light on the question, whether the world was created in "a state of intense fusion;" nor whether, if created in such a state, and at length invested with a coat of granite, the molten ocean within could have heaved with ebullition and expanded into larger dimensions, when nothing existed within it, that could of itself excite a chemical action that could evolve new measures of heat and generate fresh volumes of gas. Any one can tell, without hammering rocks for the information, whether the kettle of water which he has raised to ebullition, will, if he removes it from the fire, continue to boil, and throw off steam through a long tract of time by virtue of the heat it has already imbibed. And he can tell, with equal ease, without exploring the strata for knowledge on the sub-

ject, whether such a molten globe as your theory contemplates, inclosed in a covering of granite, would continue through innumerable ages, to surge and expand, so as to throw up vast mountain ranges, and elevate continents and islands to a great height, when no elements existed within it that could evolve a fresh measure of heat, or generate any other expansive force. The cases are exact parallels. A person may be perfectly competent, therefore, to confute your theory, without an intimate acquaintance with practical geology; for he is to confute it, not by the pickaxe and hammer, but by pointing out its contradiction to the laws of nature.

By considerations of this kind, of which you may offer a variety, you will be able to show your antagonists that the want of proper qualifications for the discussion of the subject is not peculiar to those who reject their theory. It is owing to their very inadequate understanding of their own system, that geologists have been betrayed into the extraordinary assumption that no one can be competent to criticise it, unless he belong to their profession.

You refer to a third class, who repel the suggestion that their theory is disproved by the record of the creation in *Genesis*, on the ground that it is not the office of the Scriptures to teach the natural sciences. They become excited, you say, and resentful, when they are told that they present in their speculations a direct contradiction to that record, and impeach thereby the truth, not only of that, but of every other part of the sacred volume. Moses was not a geologist, they say. He did not put forth his history of the creation, as a treatise on that branch of knowledge; and it is as absurd, therefore, to suppose that the theory we entertain of the antiquity of the earth contradicts him, as it is to imagine that statements on any other subject that are wholly dissimilar and disconnected, can interfere with one another. What, you ask, is the reply I should give to them?

We answer: We are surprised that those parties can impose on themselves by so preposterous a pretence. They virtually assume that no one, in presenting a theory of a branch of physics, no matter what he teaches, can possibly advance anything that contradicts the record of the creation in *Genesis*. Though he avers and affects to demonstrate that

the world was not created at all; that it was not created in six days; or was not created at the same epoch as its organized tenants, he can offer no contradiction, it seems, to the statements of that narrative, because Moses was not a geologist, and did not make it his object to teach the natural sciences! What convincing proofs these gentlemen give of their unequalled perspicacity! Who can doubt the propriety of their assumption that they alone have the requisite qualifications for an authoritative discussion of the subject! What a beautiful postulate, too, it is, on which they proceed—that no one can accuse their theory of offering a contradiction to Moses, unless it be on the assumption that Moses was a professed geologist, and designed his history of the creation as a treatise on that subject! For that is the implication that lies couched in their plea; as otherwise it does not follow from the fact that Moses was not a geologist, that they do not contradict his statements by their theory. Was ever a more singular confusion of ideas exhibited by persons who talk so confidently and ostentatiously of their scientific knowledge; and profess to prove all their doctrines “by the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy?” This plea, especially when put forth with the oracular airs and pompous pretensions with which we have lately seen it advanced by fifth or sixth rate writers, who are ambitious of passing for scientific theologians, can contribute very little to the vindication of the geological theory.

The points at issue between us and the advocates of that theory are not at all whether Moses was a geologist, or whether the Bible professes to teach the natural sciences; nor have they anything to do with the question whether the geological theory contradicts him or not. How does the fact that he does not profess to teach geology, show that he is not contradicted by those who assert that the earth was not created on the first day of the week of which he treats, but innumerable ages before? Does the fact that he does not teach anatomy prove that no contravention of his narrative is offered by those who deny that God is the creator of the first human pair? Does the fact that he was neither a geologist, an anatomist, a zoologist, nor an astronomer, make it absolutely impossible that those who treat of those branches can utter any propositions that are in antagonism with his?

What extraordinary pretensions for men who talk so authoritatively of the rules of philosophizing, and expatiate so largely on the brilliant advances they have made in their favorite science!

But the question whether the inspired record of the creation is impeached of error, and set aside by the geological theory, is not the question, whether Moses was a professed geologist, astronomer, or anatomist, nor has it any dependence on that question. But it is simply whether the account he gives of the origin of the world, its preparation for the tribes by which it was peopled, and the creation of vegetables, animals, and man, are not in direct antagonism with the doctrines of the geological theory, and cannot be true unless those doctrines are wholly false. And that question is not of difficult determination. The record in Genesis teaches that God created the heavens and the earth on the first day of the week in which the first human pair were called into being. The theory represents that the earth had existed through innumerable ages anterior to that epoch. Is there no contradiction here? Are not these two propositions in total antagonism? If the representation of the theory is true, is not that of the first chapter of Genesis false? They who are unable to see that such is the fact, must be admirably qualified truly to give instruction in respect to facts and truths that are demonstrated according to "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy!" The inspired record avers that light also was created on the first day: the theory affirms that it had existed and shed its beams on the earth through incalculable periods before. Is there no contradiction here? Are not these representations blank opposites? If one of them is true, must not the other be false? The history in Genesis relates that the atmosphere was created on the second day; the theory avers that it had invested the globe for ages before. Yet these accounts, it seems, according to these objectors, involve no inconsistency with each other. They are either identical propositions, or else they relate to wholly different events, and are in either case literally true and perfectly consistent with each other! The sacred history states that the waters were gathered into seas and dry land made to appear on the third day. The theory

assumes and asserts that continents of granite mounting into the sky to a towering height, had then already existed through periods that transcend our powers of calculation: Are these propositions in perfect harmony? Is there no ground on which they can be considered as contradicting each other, unless it be on the supposition that Moses was a professed geologist? What a flattering compliment these gentlemen pay to the intelligence of their readers in presuming on their assent to such an implication! And finally, the inspired historian declares that vegetables were created on the third day, fish and fowls on the fifth, and land animals and man on the sixth. The theory avers and affects to demonstrate, "by the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy," that vegetables and the several classes of animals were created at a far earlier date, and that an incalculable series of their generations had flourished and passed away before man was called into being. Is there here no antagonism? If these propositions are not contradictory to each other, can any be conceived that are?

The pretence, then, that because Moses was not a professed geologist, and it is not the design of the Bible to teach the natural sciences, nothing that is taught in the history of the creation in Genesis can be at variance with the geological theory which contradicts that history in every one of its principal articles, bespeaks either a total misapprehension of the subject, or else a most reprehensible disregard of the truth, and is wholly unworthy of men who make any claims to a knowledge of geology, or to uprightness and candor. No respectable writer, unless involved in the most unfortunate misconception, would stoop to so dishonorable an artifice to protect his speculations from the charge of contradicting the testimony of the Scriptures. It is a plea to which dashing adventurers and noisy declaimers, who aim at a momentary effect, may perhaps resort, but it should be left to them. The intelligent and honorable must disdain so unworthy an expedient to shield their theory from objection.

There are thus ample means, you perceive, to set aside these pleas by which the believers in the great age of the world attempt to defend their theory. They have their origin in their imperfect understanding of their own

system. A more extraordinary confusion of ideas was never exhibited by the advocates of a mistaken scheme. The narrow-mindedness, the want of science, the blundering, they so discourteously ascribe to others, are in fact their own. Loud complaints have been uttered, that those who have attempted to vindicate the Mosaic history of the creation from the errors with which it is charged by the geological theory, have been mere theologians, or men of letters. It may, however, with greater reason, be said, that those generally, especially of the clerical profession, who have undertaken to defend that theory from the charge of contradicting the Mosaic record, have neither been theologians nor geologists. There are exceptions certainly. Dr. Buckland, Mr. Conybeare, Professor Sedgwick, Dr. Anderson, and some others of that class, are practical geologists, and their writings—which are their principal ones—in which they treat of the facts of the science, are marked by fine powers of observation, an intimate acquaintance with the great features of the strata, caution, candor, and good sense. That praise, however, cannot be given to some other writers who have undertaken to defend their views; such for example as the late John Pye Smith, D.D., who is sometimes quoted as of high authority on the subject. Notwithstanding the oracular tone in which that author uttered himself, the display he made of his knowledge, and the condescension with which he admitted the good intentions, while he lamented the ignorance and bigotry of those who ventured to doubt the truth of the geological theory, a glance at his volume is sufficient to show that he was unaware of the real nature of the question he was discussing. The point on which it turns lay wholly beyond the sphere of his vision. He did not enter on the inquiries that are necessary in order to a discovery of the truth, nor dream of the proper field of investigation; but gave an undistinguishing assent to the theory of the popular writers; taking it for granted that all its great postulates are facts; and proceeding throughout his work on as absolute a persuasion of the reality of the granite continents and islands to which he referred the derivation of the strata as of the reality of the strata themselves. Had light enough been let into his mind to enable him to detect the true

character of the hypothesis on which he was building, he would have stood aghast at the deceptions he was imposing on himself and others. His opinions, accordingly, are not of the slightest authority. They are only dashing repetitions of the speculations of others, without any just comprehension of their import, or the grounds on which they rest.

And of that cast are several of the writers of this country, whose essays or discourses we have chanced to read, who have given their assent to the theory, and undertaken the confutation of those who regard it as contradicting the inspired history of the creation. Nothing can be more apparent, than that they have neither a just understanding of what is taught in that history, nor a thorough knowledge of practical geology. Dazzled by the novelty and interest of its discoveries, they have given their assent to the theory without a proper investigation of its real basis; and have rashly proclaimed, that unless the Mosaic record can be reconciled with it, its inspiration must be given up. It is this class of persons, accordingly, whom you will chiefly have to withstand, and whose influence is most likely to be injurious both to religion and geology. They are, however, easily answered. You have only to set forth the points that are at issue in a strong light, and show them on the one hand what it is which the inspired history in Genesis teaches, and, on the other, what it is which they affirm, and you will find you have dissipated a deep illusion under which they are proceeding, and disarmed them of their power to controvert or embarrass you.

II.

THE SIXTH VIAL.

To the friend who asks us to state whether we do not look for a far more formal and general separation of the people of the ten European kingdoms from the nationalized churches than has hitherto taken place, in fulfilment of the symbol of the drying of the Euphrates, we answer—Certainly. There is doubtless to be a withdrawal of the multitude from those establishments as extensive and as marked as

the diversion of the waters of that river from its channel by Cyrus was, and tending as naturally to their overthrow as that did to the capture and destruction of Babylon. Though, therefore, we regard the effusion of the sixth vial as having already commenced, and believe the great process of the alienation of the people from the national establishments is in progress, it is to be poured, we think, on a far greater scale, and give birth to movements as signal and decisive as the rush of the current of the Euphrates was, when the sluices were opened through which it was carried resistlessly out of its original bed into the new channels and reservoirs that had been prepared to receive it. This we should infer from the symbol itself, and from the correspondence in greatness and significance which the events foreshown generally bear to the symbols by which they are represented. Instead of falling short, they usually exceed in magnitude and importance the agents or objects by which they are foreshown. Thus the symbols of the first six trumpets are of the most significant and awful character that could have been drawn from the natural world, or constructed by the union of monster animals, and men in the same forms;—the first a fiery whirlwind sweeping over a cultivated country, and spreading it with devastation;—the next, a volcanic mountain hurled into the sea, and destroying its fish and ships by its burning lava;—the third, a meteor falling on the fountains and streams, and imbuing them with deadly bitterness;—the fourth, a stroke on the sun, moon, and stars, extinguishing one third of their light-giving power;—the fifth, the emergence of monster locusts from an abyss, torturing men with their stings;—and the sixth, the mission of innumerable hosts of monster horses and horsemen, breathing smoke, brimstone, and fire, and slaying a large portion of men. No emblems can be found of a more extraordinary and portentous character, and indicating more emphatically that the agents and agencies represented by them were to be of a very unusual and awful description. Yet these agents themselves, the Gothic, Saracen, and Turkish armies, were in their sphere more powerful, greater objects of dread and horror, and more destructive than their representatives seemed to indicate. Their slaughters, devastations, and tortures continued through

more than fifteen centuries, and carrying dismay, misery, and degradation much of the time to fifty, one hundred, and at some periods probably one hundred and fifty millions, produced together a sum of human wretchedness which no intellect could have grasped, no imagination could have conceived.

In like manner, the events in which the first five vials have had their accomplishment, have not only been as peculiar and distinguishable from each other as the symbols themselves were, and formed the great characteristics of the periods in which they have occurred as conspicuously as those symbols themselves could, but they have far transcended in greatness and awfulness what would naturally have been anticipated anterior to their occurrence. Thus the inquietude, the torturing sense of oppression, the restlessness and distortion of mind, the exasperation of pride, resentment, and revenge, which filled and heated the whole body of the French people at the commencement of the revolution in 1789, were not simply the great features of the time, in comparison with which all ordinary occurrences were without significance; but they were altogether unequalled at any other epoch; and instead of less, were as much greater in their sphere than the symbols representing them were in theirs, as tortures of the mind are greater than those of the body. So also the civil slaughters during the reign of terror were the peculiar characteristic of that period, and were without a parallel in the history of the world. Instead of surpassing them, the bloody sea by which they are symbolized, seems but an inadequate emblem of their immeasurable horrors. The long train of wars that followed for more than twenty years, represented by the conversion of the fountains and streams into blood, formed the great peculiarity of their period, and were unspeakably more dreadful than the symbol itself. Who can estimate the woes and horrors of more than one hundred great battles, or sum up the anguish and misery they carried to the multitudes who took no direct part in those hideous combats? The devouring oppressions and tyrannies that followed, were an equally conspicuous feature of the period; as was the blow at the imperial power indicated by the vial poured on the seat of the beast, and filling its kingdom with darkness. The

overthrow of the Napoleon dynasty, of the Bourbon dynasty in Charles X., and especially in Louis Philippe, and the shock given at the same time to the throne of Rome, Naples, Turin, Vienna, Munich, Berlin, and Brussels, were the great events of the era, attracting the gaze of the world by their unexpectedness and greatness, and sinking all others into comparative unimportance.

We have reason to expect, therefore, from the great features of the past, that the events foreshown under the sixth vial will at its crisis distinguish its period in an equal measure from all others, and draw to itself the eyes of the nations. The events under the others did not rise to their maximum at once, but advanced gradually in greatness and conspicuity; but each at length reached a climax from which it intermitted or declined. And the sixth, also, though it seems to have begun in each of the ten kingdoms on a considerable scale, and to have been prompted in different churches by different causes, will yet probably at some stage of its progress receive an impulse from some common and powerful cause that will raise the withdrawal of the people from the hierarchies, especially from that of the Catholic church, to a magnitude and conspicuity that shall constitute it the leading event of the time, and fasten on it the gaze of all eyes. The novelty and greatness of the results to which it will naturally lead, will certainly be sufficient to invest it with a commanding interest.

Such a movement is undoubtedly possible and probable. That a high degree of dissatisfaction and even extreme disgust is felt by great numbers of the people, with the nationalized establishments, is notorious. The population of Sardinia, Tuscany, and the Roman States, appear very generally alienated from the Catholic priesthood, and would in great numbers openly renounce allegiance to them, were all obstacles removed to a freer expression of opinion and profession of faith. The great body of the French and Germans are altogether indifferent to religion in any form, and need nothing but fashion, or a political motive, to lead them to a formal renunciation of the churches under whose jurisdiction they live. What event is to bring them to unite very generally in that act, is not indicated by the prophecy, and cannot be inferred by us from the act itself. It is not difficult,

however, to conceive of circumstances and events that would naturally prompt them to such a measure. Should Louis Napoleon, for example, instigated either by ambition or necessity to a war with Germany and Italy, march an army to the frontiers, and proclaim universal suffrage and a perfect freedom of religious faith and worship, and invite the people to become allies of France, put down their hereditary tyrants, and establish free constitutions on the ruins of their thrones, he would almost certainly either attract them in immense crowds to his standard, or compel their own rulers to grant them those privileges; the result of which throughout the whole of Italy, and a large part of Germany, would be an immediate renunciation of the Catholic and Protestant priesthood, and a profession either of the faith of the Scriptures or of no faith at all. A general combined and conspicuous movement of that kind, prompted by some such crisis, will take place at no distant day, and will prepare the way for the great struggle that is to follow, in which the hierarchies will first be denationalized and abandoned by the governments to the rage of the people, and then ravaged, despoiled, and at length struck from existence.

ART. VI.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. NOTES EXPLANATORY AND PRACTICAL ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By Albert Barnes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

WE closed our former observations on this work with the author's exposition of the sixth seal.

He exhibits again, in a striking manner, in his treatment of the vision of the sealing of the servants of God in the seventh chapter, the vague, unsettled, and empirical ideas of the nature of symbols that reign throughout his volume, and convert the prophecy into a pageant of ill-defined and flickering shadows, which fancy is left to mould into whatever shape and invest with whatever office it pleases. He does not appear to have made any progress, as he

advanced in his work, in determining what the peculiar office of a symbol is. He continues to fluctuate in seeming uncertainty whether it was itself a reality, or only a semblance of what it is called; and whether it denotes the rise and agency of a being or thing of its own nature and sphere, or one of a different order that simply presents to it some species of resemblance: and he accordingly, at every step, confounds the symbol itself with that which it signifies. Thus he introduces the notice of the four angels having control of the winds, with the announcement that "*this is of course a symbolical representation.*" "We are not to suppose that it would be *literally* fulfilled, or that at the time referred to by the vision, four celestial beings would be stationed in the four quarters of the world for the purpose of checking and restraining the winds that blow from the four points of the compass; *the meaning is*, that *events* would occur that would properly be *represented* by four angels standing in the four quarters of the world, and having power over the winds."

1. He thus treats his readers as though it were necessary to inform them that these symbols *are symbols*, in contradistinction from agents like those that are foreshown in the mere language prophecies, that are to appear in person in the world, and act the parts that are foretold of them. In other instances, instead of a positive determination of this question, he simply—pp. 412, 436—states that it is not *necessary* to suppose that the visions are to have a literal fulfilment. It would be thought to indicate a singular inaptness and confusion of mind were one who attempts an exposition of the parables to commence the notice of each one, as the parable of the Good Samaritan, with the statement that this is a *parable*, not a history: no such man ever *actually* fell among thieves on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho, and being stripped, wounded, and left half dead, and passed by without pity by a priest and a Levite, was then taken up, carried to an inn, and provided for by a Samaritan. It is not *necessary* to suppose that this is a narrative of facts. Instead, a writer of sense and taste, who had prepared himself to expound the parables by mastering the principle on which they are employed, would naturally commence his work by an explanation of their nature, and statement of the principle on which agents and events in one department of life or of nature are used in them to represent corresponding classes of persons and events in their agency, and experience among men; and thereby acquaint his reader at the outset with the laws by which their meaning is to be determined. This course, however, Mr. Barnes does not choose to pursue, and doubtless because he has no clear apprehension of the relation in which symbols are used;—not out of mere policy, that the way may be left open for construe-

tions that are not likely to give offence to the uninformed and prejudiced, which perhaps a settled rule of interpretation might render impracticable. He thus, in fact, treats his readers as though they were but children, incapable of grasping a principle or comprehending a law, and needing to be told at every step what the instrument is, the meaning of which he is endeavoring to explain to them. This appears the more absurd often from the juxtaposition in which it is placed with ostentatious references to his favorite authors for the meaning of Greek terms and other critical minutiae, and a labored display of second-hand learning on points that are of but subordinate moment.

2. He here, as in every part of his volume, mixes his description of the symbols themselves with his explanation of their *meaning*, in such a manner as to leave his readers uncertain whether he holds that such symbols were really beheld by the prophet, or only something which they might be considered as exemplifying, or resembling. "We are not to suppose," he says, "it would be *literally* fulfilled. . . . The *meaning* is, that events would occur that would properly be represented by angels;" and in respect to the angel from the sun rising, "This angel also must have been *symbolic*, and all that is implied is, that *something would be done, as if* an angel had done it." As these and the similar remarks that occur in the exposition of a large part of the symbols, are presented in that branch of his notes in which he proposes "to inquire into the fair meaning of the *language* employed in the symbols;" his readers, unless familiar with the subject, may naturally be puzzled to know whether he is really attempting to give the import of the *language*, and indicating therefore that the angels were in fact something wholly different from that which their name properly imports; or whether he is endeavoring to state what he supposes it is that they are employed to represent. Or in other words, whether he means to use the word *symbolic* as though it were synonymous with like, apparent, imaginary, or supposititious, instead of representative; or as though, as he often attempts to explain it, the symbol were simply "*as if*" it were what it is called, but was really of a wholly different nature.

3. He here again betrays his inacquaintance with the great law of symbolization, that living agents denote living agents, and men when they appear exerting agencies on earth. Not a hint is uttered by him, that as the earth, the sea, the trees, on which the winds are to act, are the representatives of *men*; and the winds themselves denote powers or agents that are to injure the men whom those departments of nature symbolize; so the angels also who control those winds and direct them in the destructive agency they are to exert,

are symbols of men who direct the force which the wind represents. Instead, he states that the four angels and their holding of the winds, mean simply "that events would occur which would be properly represented by four angels standing at the four quarters of the world, and having power over the winds." But this is absurd also, as well as in contravention of that law. For what events are there that can be supposed to have a control over such destructive agencies on men as the angels are exhibited as possessing over the winds? If the four angels and their acts denote mere events, what can be meant by the command addressed to them by the angel from the sun rising, not to hurt the earth, nor the sea, nor any trees, till he can seal the servants of God? Are those whom the sealing angel represents, to be invested with such control over "events" that they can by a word prevent their coming into existence, until the work shall be accomplished which they are commissioned to perform? Moreover, if the four angels controlling the winds only denote "events," why should the angel from the sun rising, or the servants of God whom he seals on their foreheads, denote anything more than "events?" He thus, by his inconsistent and empirical method, confutes and confounds himself in his exposition, and converts the prophecy into a maze of bewildering uncertainties.

His application of the symbol also is marked by similar errors. He regards the four angels and their controlling the winds, as denoting two threatening events:—First, invasions by the Goths, who hovered on the skirts of the empire; and secondly, an influx of error into the church. But this is wholly inconsistent with the laws of symbolization. On what principle can the same symbols be held to denote two wholly dissimilar classes of events: one a war on the bodies and property of men; the other the communication to them of false teachings, which, to be hurtful, they must voluntarily embrace? How, if such a construction is admissible, can it ever be satisfactorily determined whether a symbol indicates a process of which the body alone instead of the mind, or the mind alone instead of the body, is to be the subject? How can it be known but that all other symbols represent two species of wholly dissimilar agents and events? Moreover, if the invasion of the empire by the Goths was the calamity which was to be inflicted by the powers denoted by the winds when roused to exert their destructive force, what is meant by the command of the sealing angel, to the four angels holding the winds, not to commence their devastating agency till the servants of God could be sealed? The sealing is manifestly a religious work, and is to be wrought therefore by the ministers of religion, or religious teachers. Mr. Barnes's construction implies, therefore, that

the teachers of the servants of God were in communication with the leaders of the Gothic hordes, and directed them not to enter on the ravages of the empire till the servants of God could be sealed. Does he find any evidence in Gibbon of the imposition of such a command on the Gothic leaders by the ministers of the gospel, in the period to which he refers the vision? Did they enter into a compact of that nature with each other? Did the ministers of religion virtually give their assent to the wanton slaughters, the horrid barbarities, the infinite outrages, the Goths were to inflict on the helpless population of the empire, on condition they were only postponed till the seal of God could be impressed on his servants. What a complication of errors his construction thus involves! Can a more preposterous one be devised? Could more emphatic proofs be given, that he is not aware of the bearing of his constructions?

Next: He regards the twelve tribes of Israel who were sealed, as representing corresponding divisions or denominations in the Christian church. But no such diversities of denomination existed in the church at the period—the fifth century—to which he refers the vision. Those who differed in doctrine or in discipline at that time, continued, nevertheless, with few exceptions, to belong to the same church.

Thirdly: He holds that the sealing of the servants of God both distinguished them visibly from those who were not his servants, and indicated that they were to be preserved from the evils of the Gothic invasion. No such public and conspicuous discrimination, however, of the true worshippers from the false took place immediately prior to the entrance of the Goths into the empire. Mr. Barnes neither specifies any, nor do the historians of that period. So far from it, it was pre-eminently a season of false ideas of the nature and method of salvation, of a superstitious veneration of martyrs and relics, and gross and impassioned apostasy to the worship of saints, angels, and idols. The fancy Mr. Barnes advances that the preservation of the servants of God which he supposes to be denoted by the sealing, had its fulfilment in the exemption of a few of the churches of Rome from spoliation by the Goths, under Alaric, is equally untenable and preposterous. Those churches were the depositories of relics and other implements of worship, and were the scenes in which apostate ministers and their superstitious disciples offered their idolatrous homage. But the leniency shown by them in that instance was not usual to the Goths, but peculiar to that occasion, as Mr. Barnes might have seen, had he read the description Jerome, Procopius, and others give of the outrages to which they were addicted; or even turned to those pages of Gibbon, in which he

describes the merciless barbarities they inflicted on the Christian population of Germany and Gaul. He says: "The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed, and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. . . . And the consuming flames of war spread, from the banks of the Rhine, over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the barbarians, who drove before them in a promiscuous crowd, the bishop, the senator, and the virgin laden with the spoils of their houses and their altars."*

Jerome says, "It fills one with horror to trace the devastations of the time. For twenty years and more Roman blood has been daily shed between Constantinople and the Julian Alps. The Goths, Sarmatians, Alans, Hunns, and Vandals have plundered and devastated Scythia, Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Dacia, Thessalonica, Achaia, Epirus, Dalmatia, and the Pannonias. How many matrons, how many consecrated virgins and persons of worth and rank, have been mocked by those brutes! The bishops have been made prisoners, the presbyters and clergy of other orders slain, the churches demolished, horses stabled at the altars of Christ, and the bones of the martyrs disinterred. Wailing and groans have been everywhere, and death in all its forms."†

Such was the extraordinary mode in which they *spared* the edifices consecrated nominally to the worship of God, and *protected* those who were the most conspicuous among his professed servants! And in these terrible inflictions Italy had its full share. No part of the empire, perhaps, was more ruinously plundered, suffered proportionally a greater depopulation, or was the scene of more humiliating indignities and cruel outrages to the living.

And, finally, he represents the sealing "as continued during the long night of Papal darkness that was coming on the world." But how could that be, if, as he maintains, it was to precede the entrance of the Gothic hordes into the empire in the beginning of the fifth century? If those hordes were symbolized by the winds, and the winds were not to be roused to fulfil their destructive office till the sealing was completed, how can the sealing have been protracted through a long series of ages after those barbarians had swept over the empire, and finished their work of destruction?

Mr. Barnes's construction is thus, in every relation, mistaken, and

* Hist. Dec. and Fall, chap. xxx.

† Epia. iii. tom. i. p. 17.

misrepresents the vision,—which is second to none in the prophecy in the grandeur of its meaning,—to such a degree, that scarce a trace remains of its sublime import. He first divests it mainly of its prophetic character, by representing the angels controlling the winds, and delaying to rouse them to violence, as simply indicating that imminent dangers were impending over the empire; instead of directly symbolizing agents who were to inflict the evils symbolized by the destructive action of the winds. He exhibits those angels and their agency, as he does the great catastrophes of the natural world under the sixth seal, as mere representatives of danger, or causes of alarm; and regards it as the office exclusively of the symbols of the trumpets to denote the specific calamities in which those dangers and fears were to be realized. But that is in fact to divest these symbols of their proper function. He may as well assume that any of the other symbols represent nothing but dangers and alarms, and exclude agents and events from the things predicted, as to make that assumption in respect to these.

But next, it is a still worse error to represent that the ministers and members of the apostate church were the parties who were to receive the mark of the seal as the true servants of God, and were, with their sacred edifices—which were the depositories of relics, the shrines of martyrs to whom a superstitious homage was paid, and the images of saints that received an idolatrous worship—to be preserved from destruction by the Goths. For such was pre-eminently the character of the ministers and members of the churches at that period, and such were their temples in which they worshipped, especially in great cities. This Mr. Barnes might have seen, had he, instead of relying on a few detached recitals in Gibbon, looked even into Mosheim. That writer relates of the fifth century:—

“The riches and magnificence of the churches exceeded all bounds. They were also adorned with *costly images*, among which, in consequence of the Nestorian controversy, that of the Virgin Mary, holding the child Jesus in her arms, obtained the first and principal place. The altars and the chests in which the relics were preserved were in most places made of solid silver; and from this we may easily imagine the splendor and expenses that were lavished upon the other utensils, which were employed in the service of the church.”—*Hist. Ch.*, vol. i. p. 360.

It was of these utensils, doubtless, used in the homage of martyrs and images, that the “consecrated plate” consisted, that was found in charge of “an aged virgin devoted to the service of the altar,” the exemption of which from plunder Mr. Barnes cites

as an example of "the preservation of the church from extinction during those calamitous periods when ruin seemed about to sweep over the Roman world!" In respect to the superstitions of the period, Mosheim says, "The souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers, *while none stood up to censure or oppose this preposterous worship*. . . . They were of opinion that the places most frequented by departed spirits, were those where the bodies they had formerly animated were interred; and this rendered the sepulchres of the saints the general rendezvous of suppliant multitudes. The images of those who during their lives had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity were now honored with a *particular worship* in several places; and many imagined that this worship drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings they represented. . . . A singular and irresistible efficacy was also attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the cross, in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all sorts of calamities, and in healing not only the diseases of the body, but also those of the mind."—Vol. i. p. 348.

This picture, however, of the apostasy and debasement of the church of that age is faint compared with that presented by the writers of the period. Had Mr. Barnes read the works of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, of the latter part of the fourth century; of Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome, and Augustine, in the early part of the fifth; or the historians of the period—Socrates, Sozomen, Philostorgius—and those of a later age, as Baronius, Alexander, and others, in which the particulars are detailed of the passionate homage of the dead to which the whole church was then given, and of the arts that were employed by all orders of the ministry to foment and cherish it, he would have seen that no grosser contradiction to the prophecy can be conceived than is presented in the representation that those debased apostates to creature-worship and idolatry were the parties denoted by the servants of God on whom the seal of his name was affixed; and that the object of that symbol was to foreshow that they and the relics and idols to which they gave their homage, were to be preserved from destruction amidst the judgments by which the false worshippers generally would be swept to perdition. What a desecration of the prophecy! What an extraordinary inconsideration of the characteristics of the church of those ages! How is it that these great features of that period have so utterly eluded Mr. Barnes's notice!

He is totally mistaken, also, in respect to the epoch of the event

denoted by the sealing. Every feature of the vision, and that of the sealed in chap. xiv., indicates that it is yet future, and is immediately to precede the advent of the Redeemer. It is to take place after the catastrophes, foreshown under the sixth seal, have commenced. It is to occur at a period when the church is divided into many denominations, and therefore subsequent, at least, to the Reformation. It is to precede, by a brief space, the great tribulation which is to mark the period itself of Christ's coming; when the innumerable multitude of all nations and kindreds, bearing palms, are to pass into the rest of the millennium. The peculiarity of those denoted by the sealed is to be, a freedom from defilement by the apostate women of the prophecy, by whom are meant the harlot of Babylon and her daughters; and that purity is to distinguish them from all others; for they are to sing a new song, which no others can learn, and be exalted for their fidelity to a relation to Christ, chap. xiv. 1-5, that no others are to enjoy. It is to involve, therefore, a conspicuous discrimination of a portion of the witnesses for Christ, from all others, by a pure assertion and maintenance of his prerogatives, such as the world has not yet seen, in opposition to the false claims of the apostate churches; and is to take place, doubtless, in the great conflict with false teachers that is immediately to precede the Redeemer's advent. Could Mr. Barnes have more unfortunately missed the true meaning of the vision? Could he have given more decisive evidence that he has neglected to make himself acquainted even with the great characteristics of the church in the ages to which he refers its fulfilment?

He has misjudged of the import also of the next vision of the palm-bearing multitude, in interpreting it as a representation of the redeemed universally in heaven. It is parallel to that of the descent of the new Jerusalem from heaven, chap. xxi. 1-6, when God is to make his tabernacle with men on earth, and dwell with them, and they are to be his people, and he is to be their God; and exempt them entirely from the curse of sin. "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away:"—The same blessings precisely that are to be conferred on the palm-bearing multitude. They represent those, therefore, who are to continue in the natural life after Christ's coming, and be admitted to the joys of his millennial reign.

In the exposition of the trumpets, Mr. B., in the main, adopts the views of Mr. Elliott. Commentators, indeed, generally—whatever may be the principles of interpretation on which they ordinarily proceed, or the views they entertain respecting the period of Christ's

coming—unite in regarding the first four trumpets, as denoting the devastation and conquest of the western Roman empire by the Goths, and the fifth and sixth as symbolizing the ravage and conquest of the eastern empire by the Saracens and Turks; and that application is of great importance, from the influence it should exert on the construction of several of the subsequent visions of the prophecy. If the Turks are the slaughterers represented by the horsemen from the Euphrates, then as their sway over the eastern Roman empire and its apostate churches still subsists, it is apparent that the second woe, of which they are the agents, has not yet passed away; and thence that the slaughter and resurrection of the witnesses and fall of a tenth of the city, which are immediately to be followed by the end of that woe, have not yet taken place. As the events foreshown in the vision of the rainbow angel, chap. x., were to take place under the sixth trumpet, and a considerable period before the seventh, as is shown by the answer of the angel to the thunder voices—"the time is not yet; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God must be finished"—they must be those of the Reformation; which both answer to the symbols, and took place under the sixth trumpet, and are the only events of the kind of which the world has ever been the theatre. As the close of the second woe is to be immediately followed by the seventh trumpet, under which Christ is to assume the empire of the earth, judge and reward the holy dead, and destroy the antichristian powers, it is apparent that those events are to take place soon after the fall of the Turkish empire; and that the belief, therefore, that Christ's advent and the resurrection of the holy dead are at hand, should be as general, as the persuasion is that the Turkish power is speedily to be overthrown. This, however, Mr. Barnes does not see. He holds that at the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the antichristian powers are to be destroyed, the kingdom of Christ be established, and the reign of the saints commence. He admits, also, that under that trumpet Christ is to come, and raise and judge the dead. By a singular error, however, he supposes that not only the judgments that are to be inflicted on the apostate powers, but the millennium itself, and the everlasting salvation of the redeemed, are included under that trumpet. But the seventh trumpet is a trumpet of woe simply, not of salvation. The symbols, consequently, that properly belong to it, are only the lightnings and voices, and thunderings and earthquake, and great hail that followed it and indicate the calamities and avenging judgments of which it is to be the signal: not the annunciations by the heavenly hosts of other events that are to take place at the same

period. There are no symbols under the trumpet except those of agitation, revolution, and judgment. It is an extraordinary error, truly, to suppose that the advent of Christ, the resurrection of the holy dead, and their millennial reign, form parts of the last great woe. Instead of such a solecism, Christ himself is to inflict the last of those destroying judgments. He is then to come as the avenger of his saints, and the judge and destroyer of his enemies, and is to bring his saints with him, and invest them with the empire of the world which he is to withdraw from those who have usurped it, and exerted their power in persecuting his witnesses and worshippers.

Mr. Barnes thus, in admitting that Christ's advent and the resurrection of the holy dead, are to take place at the sounding of the seventh trumpet, admits what should lead him to see that the epoch of that advent and resurrection is to be immediately after the fall of the Turkish empire; and is, therefore, according to his own and the judgment of most antimillenarians, likely to arrive within a brief period.

To a writer like Mr. Barnes, who studies nothing independently and thoroughly, but glances hastily over the works of others, and makes up his pages of thoughts culled from or suggested by them, it naturally happens that views are sometimes partially adopted and appropriated without a proper comprehension of their relations to other parts of the symbolization which they respect. We have an instance of this in his exposition of the thunder voices, chap. x. 4. He there quits his favorite authors, and exhibits those voices as expressive; contemplates the prophet as proposing to write them under the impression that they were prophetic, and regards the oath of the angel, as a response to them, and as implying from the annunciation it presents of the time when the mystery of God is to be finished, that the seeming prediction made by those voices, was in reference to that time. This construction plainly assumes, what is obvious from the whole passage, that those thunder voices were not uttered by the rainbow angel, but by a wholly different party, and this fact is presented in the clearest manner on the pages from which he appears to have drawn his construction. Mr. B., however, did not look far enough to see this essential feature both of the symbol and the interpretation; but, in effect, assumes that the thunder voices were uttered by *the angel who pointed out the error with which they were fraught*; for he holds that the angel was the representative of Luther and his coadjutors; and yet he supposes that the false utterances that were made in those voices, were symbols of the mistakes into which Luther and the other reformers fell; which implies that what those voices uttered, denoted what the reformers

were to utter ; and, therefore, that those thunders were uttered by the angel who was the symbol of the reformers. But next, he assumes that *the apostle* also, as well as the angel, symbolized the reformers ; for he represents John's mistake in supposing the prediction of the thunder voices to be a part of the prophecy, as symbolizing the error of Luther for a time, and the other reformers, in admitting the decrees and judgments of the pope as of divine authority. And, finally, he regards those thunders as expressing opinions or judgments respecting the legitimacy and authority of the pope, *instead of the period of the destruction of the antichristian powers, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom* to which they refer. In haste to grasp and appropriate what pleased him in the construction, he thus neglected to consider its true import, and the relation in which it required him to contemplate the act of the prophet and the angel in reference to the thunders ; and in place of conforming his whole interpretation to it, employs it in such a manner—like setting a piece of new cloth on an old garment, or a gem on a soiled face—as to proclaim at once his poverty and want of taste. He forgot also, in this instance, in his hurry and excitement, as he did also in the interpretation of the measuring of the temple, chap. xi. 1, 2, and on many other occasions, to indicate the source from which he borrowed the construction. There are minds of a certain temperament that in the extraordinary dilatation they experience under the impulse of novel and striking thoughts drawn from others, appropriate them so absolutely to themselves as to lose all remembrance that *they* are not their original authors. The expansion of intellect and augmentation of emotion they feel raise their consciousness to such unusual dimensions, that their sense of their own bulk overpowers and obliterates all other realizations. They naturally, therefore, give to their own powers the credit of those rapturous moments, in which a greater sum of existence is crowded than ordinarily is enjoyed perhaps in days and weeks. That idiosyncrasy appears to occupy a conspicuous place in Mr. Barnes's constitution. He makes acknowledgments only where he neither owes any obligation, nor gains anything except by imposing on his readers, and promoting the objects of a party. When he forages and plunders, the spoils he gathers are always exhibited as the trophies of his own prowess. This bespeaks a singular self-deception : for how else is it to be accounted for ? To suppose him to pursue such a course with a consciousness of its character, were to ascribe to him a degree of meanness, of which it is to be hoped very few are capable.

In his exposition of the death and resurrection of the witnesses, he takes Mr. Elliott chiefly as his guide, interpreting their death as

denoting simply the silencing of those whom they represent; the exposure of their bodies, their being treated with indignity; their resurrection, their again receiving power to utter their testimony; and their ascension to heaven, their gaining popularity and influence with the nations. Those constructions have no ground in the symbols, nor any sanction from any other part of the prophecy. In all other instances death is regarded by Mr. Barnes himself—as under the seals, the trumpets, and the vials—as denoting literal death. Here he treats it as representing a prohibition by authority from publicly uttering a testimony; to which it presents no analogy. According to him, the witnesses not only continued in life, consciousness, and activity, and had the power of cherishing their own thoughts and uttering them to God, but were at liberty also to express them in their own families. That power was enjoyed indisputably and exercised on a great scale, and a testimony for the truth was maintained in public in many parts of Germany, at the period—immediately before the commencement of the Reformation—to which he refers the silencing of the witnesses. Death surely has no adaptation to represent such a life. Nor have dead bodies, unburied or buried, any adaptation to symbolize the living. They present the greatest possible contrast. Nor has a resurrection from death any suitability to represent a renewed utterance of a public testimony. No two changes can be more wholly unlike. In the one, the person raised is a mere passive subject of an act of omnipotence; in the other, the witness voluntarily exerts his own powers. The one involves the communication of life and the power of acting; the other is only a renewed exertion of powers that were previously possessed.

The remaining part of the exposition is, if possible, still more incongruous. What can be more solecistical than to treat a removal to another world—by which all further agency here would be precluded—as the symbol of a continued and more powerful and successful activity here? Those events present no analogy to the symbols. If they are used on the principle of analogy, the corporeal death of the witnesses must symbolize a spiritual death of those whom they represent; and their resurrection a corresponding restoration to spiritual life. But they plainly cannot be used in that relation, as the character of the witnesses forbids the supposition that in suffering death for their fidelity, they can represent men voluntarily apostatizing from God; and that in their resurrection, which is the consequence and reward of their faith and fidelity, they can represent the spiritual renovation of apostates. It would imply that the renovation of those apostates was the reward of their apostasy.

On the other hand, the symbols are suited to represent events of their own kind ; and they are the only events and conditions that have that adaptation. Death, unburied corpses, a resurrection to corporeal life, and an ascension, are peculiar objects and processes which no others have any suitableness to symbolize. Wherever, accordingly, the natural death of men is foreshown in the Apocalypse and the symbolic parts of Daniel, a natural corporeal death of animals or men is used as its representative ; and wherever a resurrection of the dead to a corporeal life is represented, a literal corporeal resurrection is employed as its symbol. Those considerations show decisively that that which is foreshown by the death, exposure, resurrection, and ascension of the witnesses, is the literal death, exposure, resurrection, and ascension of those whom they symbolize, and thence that they are yet future. The endeavors of Faber, Cunningham, Elliott, and others, to find the accomplishment of the prophecy in the events of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, seem to have sprung in a measure from the impression that a persecution is no longer practicable ; that public opinion will not now allow such an outrage. The dispositions, however, manifested by the papal and several of the civil courts of Europe within the last few years have shown the groundlessness of that persuasion. A very considerable number are now suffering for their testimony in the galleys and dungeons of Italy ; and, had the priests the requisite power, the fires of martyrdom would be speedily kindled throughout France, Spain, Portugal, and a large part of Italy and Germany. When the epoch foreshown in the prediction arrives, the church will be roused, there is reason to believe, from the misapprehensions in which it is now enthralled, the disciples of Christ will open their eyes to the true teachings of the prophecy, dismiss their unbelief and prejudice, and address themselves with earnestness to the great work of proclaiming to the world the approaching advent of the Redeemer, and preparing themselves for the judgments that are to precede and the deliverances that are to follow his coming.

Mr. Barnes regards the man-child—chap. xii. 5—as the symbol of a multitude that were about to be added to the church ; and his being caught up unto God and his throne, as denoting their protection from the persecuting rulers of the empire. But it is in every respect untenable, and involves the grossest contradiction both to the prophecy and to many of his other constructions. The destiny of the man-child was *to rule the nations with a rod of iron*, which was the peculiar prerogative of a monarch or emperor, not of the multitudes that were about to be added to the church. To suppose that that rule was to be exercised by the church, in contradistinction

from the civil state, is to suppose that *the papal hierarchy* was the body represented by the man-child ; as that is the only ecclesiastical body that has ruled the nations with a despotic sway ; and that is to suppose that the ascent of the child unto God and to his throne, according to Mr. Barnes's construction of it, indicated that the papal hierarchy was to be protected by a special and gracious providence of God from destruction by the persecuting rulers of the pagan state ! But to these obvious implications of his construction, Mr. B. himself will not consent, as they are at war with the interpretations he places on other parts of the prophecy.

The supposition that the man-child was taken up by God to his presence and throne, to signify the preservation of those on earth of whom he is held to be the representative, is equally unauthorised and inconsistent with the prophecy. His elevation to the divine presence is not a proper symbol to signify his preservation from danger on earth. It would imply that his safety was secured by his removal from the presence of his enemies ; not by his being protected against plots which they continued to form against him. Besides, if he was placed beyond the reach of the dragon by being removed from the earth, how was it that the dragon nevertheless went to make war on the earth with the remnant of the woman's seed, of whom, according to Mr. B., the man-child was the representative ! And moreover, if the seed of the woman were to be protected from the dragon "as if" they were transferred from the earth to heaven, how happened it that the woman herself found it necessary to flee from the presence of the dragon, and secrete herself in the wilderness through twelve hundred and sixty days ! Is Mr. B. aware of any proofs that there was such an extraordinary difference in the condition of the elder and younger members of the church, through the long night of the pagan and papal domination ? But the man-child was not caught up unto God and his throne in order to his protection. It is not intimated that it was by God that he was caught up there. It was undoubtedly by a wholly adverse power, and the object of his elevation was that he might there exercise his iron rule over the nations. The symbol is adapted and designed undoubtedly to show that he was to usurp the place and prerogatives of God in his empire of the world, and attempt to justify his sacrilegious and tyrannical domination over the nations and church, by the pretence of divine authority. The man-child denotes, therefore, a line of emperors in the Roman State, who arrogated the prerogatives of God over the church and people, and exercised over them an iron despotism, under which the true worshippers were generally driven into seclusion for a long period ; and such of them as were discovered and fell into the power of

the usurping rulers, were persecuted for their fidelity to Christ: and the prediction had, in all its particulars, a striking fulfilment in Constantine and his line, and the church of that period.

Mr. B. regards the seventh head of the beast which received a deadly wound, as standing for the imperial power of the western empire that was overthrown at the fall of Augustulus, and its revival as denoting the institution, more than three centuries after, of the German empire under Charlemagne. He maintains also that that German empire is the organization which is denoted by the image to the beast. These are singular errors. The Roman imperial power in the western empire was annihilated—not merely impaired—at the dethronement of Augustulus; and its place was taken by the first of a series of Gothic monarchies, one of which has continued to occupy it to this time. After the fall of the Roman rulers, symbolised by the seventh head of the beast, the power of the empire passed to the ten Gothic kings, represented by the horns, of which Charlemagne was one, and remains with them to the present hour. The Carlovingian and Hapsburg lines can no more be regarded as denoted by the seventh head of the beast, than the Bourbon line of France and Spain, or the Plantagenet, Tudor, Stuart, or Hanoverian lines of England. He makes a horn of the beast, the symbol of the same power as its seventh head, which is incongruous. The same power cannot fill the office of both a head and a horn. The seventh head, moreover, was to continue only for a short time, but the Germanic empire continued for upwards of a thousand years.

The supposition that that Germanic dynasty is the power denoted by the image of the beast, is still more mistaken and incongruous. How could that dynasty be the image of the beast, when it was a part of the beast itself, or one of its horns? The supposition that the image took the place of the beast, exercised its power, and received its homage, implies that the beast had passed away or been superseded. The beast, however, or the power denoted by it, was never superseded by the German dynasty. The beast subsists yet, and is to continue till the last catastrophe arrives. It is not to be destroyed till the last great battle. The image of the beast resembled it in its whole form, not simply the form of one of its horns: and as it was a different thing from the beast, and contemporary with it, that which it denotes must be different from that which is symbolized by the beast, but that yet presented a resemblance to it, like that which was borne by the image itself to the beast. Neither, however, can have denoted the dynasty of the German empire. The beast did not denote that dynasty, but the dynasties of the whole of

the ten kingdoms of the western Roman empire. The image, therefore, did not denote those dynasties, but an organization that was commensurate—like that symbolized by the beast—with the whole of the ten kingdoms, not that which was confined to one of them. It was an ecclesiastical organization therefore, not a civil or military one; as there was no other civil rule than that which the beast itself denoted. The corresponding organization which the image denotes was that of the hierarchies of the several kingdoms, the union of which into one combination, with the Pope at its head, constituted a body that resembled the civil power of the Roman empire under the imperial dynasty, denoted by the seventh head after which it was modelled. This construction accords with all the conditions of the symbol, while that presented by Mr. B. corresponds with none of them. The hierarchies of the ten kingdoms were thus united into one organization, and together formed a structure that resembled the combination of civil rulers symbolized by the beast. It extended throughout the western empire, and like that under its seventh head, had in the Pope an absolute chief. The rulers of the Germanic empire presented no such resemblance to the combination of rulers—co-extensive with the ten kingdoms—denoted by the beast. That combination of hierarchies was established at the instance of the two-horned beast—the representative of the papacy—and drew from it its life and authority. The dynasty of the German empire was not constituted by the Pope, nor did it owe to him its life and authority. He crowned Charlemagne, indeed; but that prince was as absolutely the monarch of his empire before as after that ceremony. The population of the whole empire worshipped the combination of hierarchies denoted by the image, while they at the same time paid a religious homage to the civil powers of the empire of which the beast is the symbol. But they paid no such homage to the rulers of the German empire, except as a part of that combination of which the beast was the representative. On this construction the two beasts and the image symbolized powers that were distinct from each other, that acted in different spheres, and that exercised contemporaneously an absolute authority in their several departments. The beast of the ten horns symbolized the whole combination of civil rulers in the ten kingdoms. The beast of two horns denoted the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of the Roman States, or the papal territory. The image represented the Catholic hierarchies of the ten kingdoms united in a body with the Pope as their head. Mr. B.'s exposition, with the exception of the second beast, has no such correspondence with the powers of the empire. He takes no notice of the united ecclesiastical powers of the ten kingdoms repre-

sented by the image. He sets aside the beast, also, the symbol of their united civil powers, and substitutes one of its horns in its place; and finally, he makes that horn and the image the representative of the same civil dynasty.

Mr. B. regards the events symbolized under the first five vials as having already taken place in the revolutions and wars, commencing with the overthrow of the French monarchy in 1792, and extending to the fall of the papacy in 1798. He interprets the sixth as denoting the decay of the Turkish power; and holds that on the effusion of the seventh, the whole array of the anti-christian forces represented by the two beasts, the image, and the false prophet—which he erroneously interprets of Mahomedanism—are to be destroyed, the kingdom of Christ established, and his millennial reign and the reign of the saints commence; and the period of those events he considers as near. He says, on chap. xix. 11–21:

“The general idea is, that these great anti-christian powers which had so long resisted the gospel and prevented its being spread over the earth, which had shed so much blood in persecution, and had so long corrupted and deceived mankind, *would be subdued*. *The true religion* would be as triumphant *as if* the Son of God should go forth as a warrior in his own might, and secure their leaders for punishment, and give up their hosts to the birds of prey. This destruction of these great enemies—which the whole course of the interpretation leads us to suppose is still future—prepares the way for the millennial reign of the Son of God.”

But in denying, as he does, that Christ is then to come in person, destroy those foes, and institute his kingdom, he virtually denies that there is to be at that epoch a destruction of his enemies and an establishment of his kingdom. If the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies, are not to be destroyed by the Son of God and his armies in person, then Christ and his redeemed hosts must have acted in the vision as the symbols of men by whom the conquest of those anti-christian powers is to be achieved. And if that be so, he must be taken as having acted as the mere symbol of men, in the vision of his coming in the clouds and investiture with the dominion of the earth. Dan. vii. 13, 14. But that is in direct contravention of analogy, and of all the representations of that prophet and of the Apocalypse. It is an infinite solecism to suppose the Son of God to appear in the visions as the symbol of creatures and men. It were to assume that those creatures are in their sphere what the Son of God is in his, and are therefore possessed of the attributes and prerogatives of God. Can a greater and more reprehensible misrepresentation of the prophecy be devised! That construction is, moreover, expressly forbidden by the

representation, chap. v., that no angel or other dependent being can represent the Redeemer in the visions, because of the inadequacy of a created nature to his work; and that, for that reason, he himself appeared in the visions, opened the seals, and conducted the revelation. On Mr. Barnes's interpretation, moreover, the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet is not to be taken as a *destruction* of the powers represented by those symbols; but only of their being conquered, or reduced to subordination, and a minority. The slaughter is only to be a "moral" slaughter. The anti-christian hosts are still to live, and simply to be "subdued," which can amount to nothing more than the transference of the supreme civil administration of the earth from their hands to those of the Protestants. There is not to be, therefore, on that view any new kingdom of Christ then set up, but only an enlargement of his present kingdom, and elevation to a supremacy over Papists and Mahomedans. But this is against the clearest teachings of the sacred word. It is shown—Daniel vii. 14—that Christ is to come in the clouds and receive the dominion of the earth at the time of the judgment and destruction of the wild beast. It is shown—Rev. xix. 11-21—that he is thus to come visibly in the display of his peculiar rights and prerogatives as judge and avenger, and is himself to be the great agent in the destruction of the anti-christian hosts. And it is expressly revealed in the prediction made through language instead of symbols—2 Thess. ii. 8—that it is at his coming and by his revelation of himself, that the man of sin, the great author of the apostasy in the church, is to be destroyed. Mr. B. moreover, in setting aside these specific testimonies that Christ's advent is to take place at that period, puts it out of his power to show that he is to be personally present at the judgment—Rev. xx. 11-25—that is to follow the close of the thousand years. If his presence in the vision—Dan. vii. 13, 14, and Rev. xix. 11-21—is no proof of his personal and visible presence in the scenes which they represent, then plainly his presence in the vision of the judgment—Rev. xx. 11-15—is no proof that he is to be present at the great trial which that is employed to foreshow. Mr. B. thus divests himself of the power of proving that Christ is ever to come in person at all to raise and judge the dead. The principle on which he proceeds, applied to the other prophecies, converts them, as effectually as it does this, into mere predictions of "moral effects," and erases the great doctrines of a resurrection, a judgment, and a new and immortal life, from the page of inspiration.

He, in like manner, denies that the resurrection of the holy dead is foreshown Rev. xx. 4-6. In his exposition of the passage he

follows Mr. Brown, and denies that the symbols of the vision represent a corporeal resurrection, first, on the assumption that such a resurrection, if foreshown, would be foreshown in other passages, and with greater clearness. But this is the assumption on which rationalists generally proceed in setting aside the clear teachings of the sacred word, and if legitimate, would render it impossible to verify any revelation to which the unbelieving and captious might choose to offer objection. But it is as false in fact, as it is dangerous in principle. That the resurrection of the righteous is to precede that of the wicked, is specially taught, *Corin. xv. 22-26*. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits: then they that are Christ's at his coming; afterwards the last band or remainder when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." That this resurrection of the third band is to be after the millennium, is shown by the reason that is given of his retaining the kingdom to that epoch. "For he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." That destruction of death, it is expressly shown, *Rev. xx. 14*, is to take place at the time of the resurrection and judgment of the unholy; for death is then to be cast into the lake of fire. It is taught also in other passages, first, that the saints are to be raised at Christ's second coming, *1 Thess. iv. 16, 17*: and next, that he is to come at the destruction of the anti-christian powers, which is to take place at the commencement of the thousand years, *2 Thess. i. 7-10, ii. 8, Rev. xix. 11-21, Dan. vii. 9-14*.

He next asserts, in proof that it cannot denote a corporeal resurrection, that there is nothing said in the passage of a literal resurrection of the *bodies* of the dead. "Of this there is not one word, one intimation, one hint in the passage before us. John says expressly, as if to guard the point from all possible danger of this construction, that he saw the *souls* of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus; he saw them 'living' and 'reigning' with Christ—raised to exalted honor during that period, as if they had been raised from the dead; but he nowhere mentions or intimates that they were raised up from their graves; that they were clothed with bodies; that they had their residence now literally on the earth; or that they were any way otherwise than disembodied spirits."

But the point on which the question turns is, whether the vision which the prophet beheld, was a vision of persons raised from death to a corporeal life. Mr. Barnes assumes the very position he affects to prove, when he asserts "that there is nothing said in the passage of the literal resurrection of the bodies of the dead." And his as-

sertion is as mistaken, as his assumption is illogical. In the first place, it is expressly declared by the revealing Spirit that that which was presented to the apostle in the vision, was the first resurrection; and that term is shown in the application to it of the ordinal first, to be and to denote a real corporeal resurrection. Ordinals are applied to things of the same name, only when the name is used to denote things of the same nature. Their office is simply to designate the order in respect to one another in which things of the same nature exist or occur. The first man, is the first only in relation to another that in some relation came next in succession to him. The first president of the United States was first president—only in relation to other presidents that held the office subsequently to him. So, a resurrection can be a first resurrection only in relation to another resurrection of the same kind, that follows it in the order of time. But there are no other resurrections but those that are literal of bodies, that are distinguished from each other in the Scriptures by numerals, or other terms that indicate that they were to occur in succession to each other. And there are three that are distinguished from each other in that manner, 1 Cor. xv. 21–24. “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own band; Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ’s at his coming; afterwards the last band, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.” Here is then, besides Christ’s resurrection, a specific distribution of the literal resurrections of men that are to take place, into two classes, according to the order in which they are to occur. The appropriation, therefore, of the ordinal first, to that which is exhibited in the vision, shows that it is a literal resurrection, and denotes the resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the millennium. And the other corporeal resurrection in respect to which it is denominated the first, is indicated in the passage, as that which is to take place after the thousand years have passed, and is symbolized like this, v. 11–15, by a literal corporeal resurrection. “This is the first resurrection. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” And there is no other species of resurrection to which the ordinals first and second can be applied. There is no first and second moral resurrection. There is no moral resurrection of disembodied souls. The supposition that that which the apostle saw, was a moral or spiritual resurrection,—that is, a transformation of souls from moral death to moral life,—is in total contradiction to the character of the martyrs

and witnesses of Jesus, and a paradox. The life and reign which are predicated of them, were a life and reign on which they entered by a resurrection from death; and this is shown again by the distinction it constituted between them and the rest of the dead, who lived not till the thousand years were past, when they also were raised to a corporeal life. As the term "lived," in its application to the rest of the dead, denoted a restoration from death to a corporeal life; so it is used in that sense in its application to those who were the subjects of the first resurrection.

It is clear, then, beyond all reasonable debate, that the symbolic spectacle which is denominated by the Spirit the first resurrection, or the symbol of the first resurrection, was itself a literal corporeal resurrection, or vision of the holy dead raised to a corporeal life. But that renders it certain that the event which it is employed to foreshow, is also a corporeal resurrection. It is not adapted to symbolize any other event. To suppose it to be employed to represent a moral change, would be to suppose that the holy dead were employed to symbolize the living wicked who were to be spiritually renewed; which is against analogy and impossible. What adaptation have the holy to represent the unholy? Or else it would be to suppose that the holy dead themselves were to be the subjects of the spiritual renovation foreshown by the symbol; but that is equally impossible, as they are not to need any such regeneration.

In the next place, a literal resurrection of the dead is employed as a symbol of a literal resurrection of the dead, in the vision of the last resurrection, chap. xx. 11-15. That Mr. Barnes and all commentators admit; and that accordingly must be held to be the law of the symbol, and the relation, therefore, in which it is employed in this vision. To deny it is to deny that the symbolization of the last resurrection is a symbolization of a literal resurrection; and to strike from his hands the only proof he has, that there is to be a literal resurrection after the close of the thousand years. Such is the issue of Mr. B.'s very positive and reiterated assertion that there is not "one word, one intimation, one hint" in the passage, "that the bodies of the saints are to be raised up at the beginning of the millennial period." He must grant that there is a specific symbolization here of the corporeal resurrection of the holy dead at that epoch, or else deny that there is any symbolization whatever in the prophecy of a bodily resurrection.

But his construction not only thus directly contradicts—it confounds and degrades the vision in the most unhappy manner. What is meant on his interpretation, of the representation that the souls of those who had been put to death, and whoever had not worship-

ped the beast and his image, "*lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years!*" What on his construction was that life of the souls which was used as the symbol of the life which was foreshown? It was not a mere *existence*. That he admits. It was not a mere *conscious* existence. That he admits also. Nor was it an acquisition of immortality, or any new ground or form of existence as mere souls. That he likewise admits. What then was it? He does not inform us; nor can he. We may safely challenge him, on his view of the passage, to give an answer that will not involve him in inextricable difficulties, and confound his whole construction. But if he cannot tell what the life was that was predicated of the symbolic souls, he plainly cannot prove that it was *not* a corporeal life—a life obtained by a resurrection from death—and a natural and indubitable symbol, therefore, of a literal corporeal resurrection of those whom they represented.

Next: Who is it, on his view of the passage, whom those symbolic souls represented? Disembodied souls like themselves; or men in the natural body? Disembodied souls are certainly not adapted to represent mankind in the natural body. Their nature, their mode of existence, their state as subjects of the divine government, are dissimilar in the extreme, and present contrasts instead of analogies to each other. Mere souls, then, cannot be supposed to be used as representatives of any but mere souls; and that, accordingly, is the relation in which they are used under the fifth seal, and, undoubtedly, also in this vision. On the ground then, maintained by Mr. B., that the souls in this vision did not enter on a new life, by the resurrection and reunion to them of their bodies, they must be taken as symbolizing mere disembodied souls. But if that is the relation in which they are employed, then they must be taken as foreshowing that the mere souls of the holy dead—remaining disembodied—are to live and reign with Christ. But that is wholly against the interpretation Mr. B. puts on the vision; as he holds that instead of the dead, the parties represented by the souls are men in the natural life. It puts it out of his power, also, to show what it is that is foreshown by the vision. For, first, what is the peculiar life that is predicated of those souls? And next, what is the peculiar life that is *represented* by that life, and foreshown of those for whom they stand? He certainly cannot give a satisfactory answer. As he cannot tell what the peculiar life is that is predicated of the souls in the vision, he plainly is in no condition to tell what the peculiarity of that life is, which, according to his assumption, the life of those souls is employed to represent. On the other hand, if the symbolic souls do not represent souls of their own order, and show by the state in

which they lived and reigned, what the state is to be of the souls of the holy dead during the millennium, then plainly it is not the souls of the martyrs, but persons of a wholly different class, who are to enjoy that which is denoted by the vision. The martyrs and confessors of Jesus are to have no direct personal interest in it, and Mr. B. must be wholly mistaken in his representation, that the import of the vision is, that there is to be "an honoring of the martyrs"—during the thousand years—"as if they would live and reign with Christ. Their names would be vindicated; their principles would be revived; they would be exalted in public estimation above other men; they would be raised from the low rank in which they were held by the world in times of persecution, to a state which might well be represented by their sitting with Christ on the throne of government, and by their being made visible attendants on his glorious kingdom." In all this he thus completely deserts his own construction. If the martyrs are not themselves the parties who are represented by the souls in the vision, but a wholly different class, and men in the natural life; then plainly that which is foreshown by them is not to be theirs. The life and reign, the favor and blessedness their symbolic life and reign represent, are to belong to the class only of whom they are the mere symbols.

But, in addition to these fatal objections, Mr. Barnes's construction is in every relation a consummate perversion and degradation of the vision. The symbols themselves are of the greatest significance and dignity. The resurrection of the holy from the debasement and ruin of death to an immortal life, is one of the greatest and most glorious of the benefits the Redeemer is to bestow on them. It is the great gift by which their redemption is to be completed, and they are to be fitted to serve him in his eternal kingdom. And to live and reign with him during the vast period denoted by the thousand years, and share in the glories and bliss of his kingdom through that vast round of ages, is the loftiest honor to which they are to be exalted. Now, according to Mr. B., what is it that those august symbols are employed to represent? Anything of a corresponding greatness and beauty? Anything of a preciousness and glory that can hold an analogous place in the estimation of the redeemed? Not at all. They denote nothing, according to him, except that the martyrs and other holy dead *are to be held in high estimation by the population of the earth* during that period! They are to be *recollected, venerated, and honored!* It is this, according to him, that is to be as great and inestimable a gift to them, as a resurrection to a glorious life, and a visible reign with Christ in his kingdom on the earth would be; so vast and ineffable a blessing, that a resurrection

from death to immortality, the last great step to their complete redemption, and a session with Christ on his throne in his kingdom, are appropriate symbols to set it forth! What more revolting misrepresentation and degradation of the vision can be conceived? It is to make Christ the representative of men in the natural life. It is to make the infinite gifts and honors he confers on his redeemed, the symbols of the favorable opinions and respect with which the piety of the martyrs and confessors are to be contemplated—a sentiment quite in character in a Catholic commentator, but most uncongenial to the spirit of Protestantism. Could Mr. B. have given higher proofs that he is a stranger to the true significance of the symbols and genius of the prophecy?

But why should the prophecy be thus emptied of all its lofty significance, and perverted and desecrated to this extreme, in order to get rid of the revelation which it makes, that the holy dead are to be raised at the commencement of the thousand years, and are to reign with Christ during the vast round of ages denoted by that period? Is their resurrection to abridge their dignity and happiness, and be an evil instead of a blessing? Are any important ends to be gained by their continuing under the power of death through three hundred and sixty thousand years after Christ fully establishes his kingdom here, and commences his reign of grace over the nations that is never to end? Are they to have any offices to fill in other worlds more important to the universe than those of kings and priests in his kingdom here? They are actually to be raised from death to immortal life, to be made kings and priests unto God, and to reign with Christ on the earth. Mr. B. himself will not go so far as to maintain that all the revelations to that effect are a mere sham, and indicate nothing more than that they are to be held in high respect by those who are to live on the earth during the millennium? Why, then, should they not be raised and exalted to their stations as kings and priests in Christ's kingdom, when he comes to assume the sceptre of the earth, and judge and reward them? Is there any intimation that they are to reign with him anywhere else than on the earth? Mr. Barnes does not cite any; nor do any of those whom he follows; nor can they. What inducement, then, is there thus to pervert and debase the prophecy, in order to make out that their resurrection is not to take place until three hundred and sixty thousand years after Christ enters on his reign here, and all nations become obedient to his sway?

Is the presence of the glorified saints on the earth during that reign, and the agencies as kings and priests they are to exert, to be disadvantageous to the nations? Are there any intimations in the

prophecy that the descent of the New Jerusalem from heaven to earth, is to be regarded with jealousy, aversion, or regret, by the sanctified of that period ! Does John utter anything implying that he contemplated it with sadness and discouragement ! Are there any hints that the nations considered it as an abridgment of their privileges, or a detraction from their dignity and happiness, that they were to walk in the light of it, drink of the waters of its river, and be healed by the leaves of its tree of life ! Are there any indications that it is wholly unsuitable to God, to descend with that city and make it his tabernacle with men ; that it is an infinite degradation to him, and infinitely unfavorable to the virtue and happiness of the race that Christ should reveal himself visibly in it ; and be the light and glory of it ! Does not the whole representation exhibit it as infinitely suitable and glorious to him ; and immeasurably propitious and blissful to men ! Why then should it be contemplated by Mr. B., and those whom he follows, with such extreme dislike, and the prophecy subjected to such false and debasing constructions in order to erase it from its pages !

But the doctrine cannot be struck from the vision by the process to which Mr. B. subjects it, nor by any other. The more thoroughly it is investigated, and the more fully the implications of his construction are understood, the more apparent it will be that the spectacle which the prophet beheld was a literal resurrection of the holy dead ; or the holy dead raised from death, and reigning with Christ ; and that it was a literal resurrection of the holy dead which it was employed to foreshow.

Mr. B., in interpreting the vision of the New Jerusalem, follows Mr. Brown and others in exhibiting that city as the symbol of the heavenly world in which he supposes the redeemed are, after the last judgment, to reside. This is an extraordinary mistake ; as, 1. It is expressly explained in the prophecy as the symbol of the bride, the Lamb's wife, by whom is meant the risen and glorified saints. How, then, can it denote a remote material world ! 2. It is represented as coming down from heaven to the earth, and being the tabernacle in which God is here to dwell with men. How, then, can it stand for another world stationed in the distant realms of space ! 3. The nations, it is foretold, are to walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth are to bring their honors into it. But how can they carry their honors to it, if situated in the remote regions of space where it will be inaccessible to them ! 4. And, finally, it is expressly foretold that the Israelites are to inherit their land and the righteous possess the earth for ever, and that Christ is to reign on the throne of David and over the house of Jacob for ever ; but how can that be

if the land of Israel, the earth, and the throne of David, are soon to be annihilated and the house of Jacob cease to exist? Instead of that absurd construction, the New Jerusalem is the symbol of the risen and glorified saints, as Babylon is the symbol of the apostate hierarchies; and its descent from heaven denotes the descent of those saints to reign with Christ on the earth. The earth is accordingly—freed from the curse brought on it by the fall—to continue for ever, and be the scene for ever of their residence and reign. The kingdom they are to possess is to be under the whole heaven; all other dominions are to be subject to it; and it is to be everlasting.—*Dan. vii. 13-27.* And why not? Why should not the Redeemer verify his promises respecting the restitution of the earth, and its eternal inheritance by his saints, as well as his other promises? Why should he not redeem the earth from the curse, as well as its inhabitants, and make it, as well as them, an everlasting monument of his victory over his enemies? What is to be gained by annihilating it, as though it were beyond his infinite power and wisdom to make it the instrument and theatre of his glory?

Such are some of the principal errors of Mr. Barnes's commentary. The number we have passed without notice is far greater. They swarm on every page. But these are enough to show that it not only is of no critical value, but that it most seriously misrepresents the prophecy, and must mislead those who take it as a guide. What better could be expected of a writer who never, as far as appears, entered into any inquiry in respect to the principles on which the symbols are used, who commenced his work under a conviction that the prophecy is not susceptible of a satisfactory explanation, and who finally took Gibbon as the proper guide to its meaning, instead of the Spirit of inspiration, who presents a key to the interpretation, in the exposition he has given of many of the principal symbols!

Though marred by these great faults, there is one point of interest on which it may be considered as throwing some light. It was written for sale. It was designed to fall in with the current views of those in this country and Great Britain to whom Mr. B. looks for patronage; and to excite and satisfy their curiosity. There is a careful avoidance in it of everything that conflicts with their prejudices, or would carry them essentially beyond the point they have already reached in their anticipations of the future. There is scarce a hint, for example, so far as we have noticed, that the great judgments with which the nations are soon to be smitten are to fall on any except Papists and the upholders of the Papacy. Special care is taken not to disturb any of the favorite notions of the Protestants

of Great Britain. The wild beast, the image, Babylon, and the false prophet, denote nobody but Catholics and Mahometans. No vials of wrath, therefore, are to be poured at the west on any but the Pope and his lieges; nor at the east but on those who hold the Mahometan faith.

Yet notwithstanding this cautious adjustment of the volume to the popular impressions at the moment, he exhibits the prophecy as foreshowing, with the most unquestionable certainty, that the whole combination of the civil and ecclesiastical anti-christian powers is soon to be overthrown and the Papacy for ever exterminated; and represents the first six vials, which indicate the last great plagues, as already poured, in the calamities that have fallen on the west and the east in the last sixty years. The same impressions are now very frequently expressed by writers who are not expectants of Christ's pre-millennial advent. They may be taken, therefore, as the views that have become pretty generally current.

This indicates a very great change and progress of opinion. It is not a long period since the great proportion of those even in the sacred office had no settled or distinct notions on the subject. Whether the anti-christian powers were to be destroyed in fifty or five hundred years, or were not to be destroyed at all, not one in scores had any clear apprehension. Now most give such attention to the subject as to form specific views respecting the future. A change equally great has taken place in the nature of their views. How long is it since it became a clear and conspicuous element of the general belief, that the civil rulers of Europe are the leading parties denoted by the wild beast, and that their overthrow is to take place at the time, and is to be the condition, of the redemption of the race from the thralldom of moral and social evil? A vast proportion of the present active generation never heard the suggestion—unless in a mere political relation—till within a few years. How long is it since any considerable number could be found who regarded the calamities with which Europe was scourged from 1789 to 1830 as those that are symbolized by the first five vials? It is but a short time since the suggestion was regarded here with general ridicule. It is now very generally admitted to be as indubitable as the accomplishment of the trumpets is in the wars and slaughters by the Goths, Saracens, and Turks; and the conviction has become common to the thinking of all classes, that no long period is to pass before disturbances, revolutions, and conflicts will arise, in which the Papacy will receive its final overthrow, and the despotic dynasties, that have been at once its defenders and its instruments, will perish along with it.

This is a vast change; and by whom or by what has it been brought about? In a considerable measure undoubtedly by the great events of the last ten years, and especially of the last five; in a great degree, however, by millenarian writers, by whose labors it is chiefly that the correspondence of the great features of the French revolution, and the wars and catastrophes that followed, with the predictions of the first six vials, has been set forth in such a manner as to produce the general conviction that it is to them that those symbols refer. This is itself a very important result of their labors, and should encourage them to go on in their endeavors to lead the church to a just understanding of the prophecy. They will hereafter have more numerous, and, on many points, less prejudiced readers; and the great movements of divine providence will soon corroborate the truths they maintain in such forms as to overcome the obstacles that still subsist to their general reception.

2. *COURSE OF THE HISTORY OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY.* By M. Victor Cousin. Translated by O. W. Wight. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1852.

THIS is an elegant edition of M. Cousin's celebrated lectures on the subjects, principles, and history of intellectual philosophy. The translator has performed his task with skill, and exhibits the author with his peculiar air, vivacity, and point. M. Cousin is a speculatist of the German school. The deity is with him but an idea or logical conception; his Christianity is but a development or mode of human thought; and inspiration only an impulse of natural reason. His main doctrines are accordingly false. His mode, too, of treating subjects is often far from satisfactory. He sometimes declaims only when he professes to define and state essential principles; and in aiming at novelty and brilliance, he not unfrequently loses himself in a cloud of specious words. He nevertheless handles many of his topics with eminent tact, subjects the doctrines and facts which he discusses to an unusually keen analysis, and gives a bold and imposing outline of the forms which the speculations of philosophers have assumed in different ages.

4. *HAND-BOOKS OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY AND ASTRONOMY.* By Dionysius Lardner, D.C.L., formerly Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in University College, London. Illustrated

by upwards of four hundred engravings on wood. Philadelphia : Blanchard & Lea. 1852.

THIS volume, in fact, consists of three, with separate titles, and forming together a work of seven hundred and fifty pages. The first treats of the Nature and Properties of Matter, the Laws of Force and Motion, and the Theory of Machinery ; the second of Hydrostatics, Hydraulics, Pneumatics, and Sound ; and the third of Optics : and they are excellent compendiums of these subjects. The number of definitions, laws, facts, and solutions of curious and important phenomena which they present is very great. Many of the problems and explanations have all the charm of brilliant experiments. The style is simple and clear, and the statements of the most intricate propositions and descriptions of the most complicated processes, intelligible to readers of all classes. This volume is to be followed by another on Heat, Electricity, Magnetism, and Astronomy.

4. A LETTER TO THE REV. DANIEL DANA, D.D., on Professor Park's Theology of New England. By Nathan Lord, President of Dartmouth College. Boston : Crocker & Brewster. 1852.

DR. DANA is one of the trustees of the Theological Seminary at Andover, whose business it is to elect its teachers, and arraign and dismiss them, if they violate the conditions of their office by inculcating doctrines that are at variance with the creed of the institution. Accordingly, under the conviction that important views advanced by some of its professors, especially the late Mr. Stuart and Mr. Park, are unscriptural, and subversive of the doctrines of the seminary and the gospel, he has endeavored to induce the trustees to bring the question to a trial, and compel the delinquent parties either to quit their stations, or conform in their instructions to the statutes of the institution ; but without success. A majority of the trustees either approve of the new doctrines, or do not regard them as sufficiently objectionable to render it expedient to notice them ; and the policy of the influential ministers and laymen, generally, of the denomination, appears to be to allow the professors to take their own course ; so that they have, in effect, their public acquiescence and sanction in revolutionizing the seminary, and making it the instrument of assailing and controverting the doctrines it was established to teach, and propagating a different theology.

It is Dr. Lord's object, in his letter, to express his concurrence in Dr. Dana's objections to the religious and philosophical speculations

that now prevail in New England ; to state his views of Professor Park's theology, and the causes by which his and other new doctrines that are current have been introduced ; and to indicate the issues to which he deems they are tending.

In order to understand the bearing of the discussion, it should be considered that the question treated by Professor Park in his Convention Sermon, is wholly different from that with which he occupies himself in the article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January last, to which Dr. Lord mainly refers. In the former he advances the doctrine that there are two theologies, one of the intellect which consists of truth just as it is, but is for that reason unadapted to excite the heart to holy affections, and is actually mischievous instead of beneficial ; the other, the theology of the heart, which is fabricated by the heart itself, to suit its own sensibilities, and is false, but yet is the theology through which all holy affections are excited. The point he aims to maintain in the essay in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in place of being the same, is, according to Dr. Lord's representation, simply that the distinctive New England theology is comprised in the three "radical principles" that "sin consists in choice ; that our natural power equals our duty, and also limits it." On the supposition, then, that Professor Park proves his point in his January essay, it does not touch the question at all agitated by him in his Discourse ; nor show that the ministers of New England who hold those three "radical principles" acquiesce in any measure in his two theologies ; as there is no logical connexion between them. Whatever judgment then may be formed of his essay on the New England theology—we have not yet had leisure to read it—it does not affect the doctrine of his Discourse. His two theologies remain precisely where they were placed by him in that publication. Nor is it, on his system, of the slightest consideration whether he holds what he denominates the three New England doctrines, nor whether those doctrines are true ; as, according to him, if they are true, and thence belong to the theology of the intellect, they can exert only a deluding and depraving influence, and ought never to be preached ; inasmuch as he avers—"a punctilious divine, preaching the exact truth in its scientific method," actually imparts "to the understanding of his hearers either no idea at all, or a wrong one ; while . . . a pulpit orator using words . . . which in their literal import are false," yet lodges "in the hearts of his people the substance of truth."

This total diversity of the two discussions and disconnexion with each other, has not been properly kept in mind by readers and writers. It seems, indeed, to be supposed by many that Professor Park's real or imagined success in his essay, is an absolute vindica-

tion of the two theologies of his Discourses. No error could be greater. The vindication of his two theologies, if ever accomplished by him, is altogether future.

Dr. Lord does not present a very flattering view of Professor Park's discriminative powers :

"Professor Park is a remarkable writer. He is most remarkable for seeing things, not as they are, but as they appear; images, and not realities; and his images strike, like natural objects upon the retina, upside down. All things are ideal to him; yet not in the highest style of eclecticism; for, unfortunately for his attainment of the greatest ideal good, 'his pure reason' is yet dragged and limited by his disadvantages of position. The Assembly's Catechism and the Statutes at Andover are realities, heavy in black letter, and they yet hold him within the atmosphere of the earth. He is not like one already in Elysium, but in a gallery of daguerreotypes. He looks upon resemblances, but no eye lightens upon him, no cheek glows at him, no voice responds to him, no hand is outstretched to greet him. He sees exactness and propriety of form, but is not enlivened by the more agreeable accidents of color, motion, and address. There is beauty, but not life. All is pleasant to the sight, but the heart is cold. And his spectres are visible only when turned from the sun. So far as a professor of theology so hampered can be, he is a speculative philosopher."

He regards him as perfectly sensible that the doctrines he maintains are at war with the creed of the seminary :

"Professor Park is aware that the Bible and the Catechism do not teach his speculative orthodoxy, according to the natural laws of interpretation. He knows that the statutes which he has subscribed do not teach it. No man who reads the Bible, or those honest compends of it, *as he reads any other book*, would imagine that it could be justified by those standards. The Christian people of New England did not, till the new philosophy opened their eyes to a higher style of exegesis. To justify such a fanciful interpretation was Professor Park's real though not ostensible object in all the discussion which he has carried on. If it be science, it is not that experimental science which was current in New England when Christian experience was practical and not sentimental, and when the 'common sense' that approved the theology of the Bible and the Catechism, was the common sense of the church of God, in distinction from a few excited schoolmen, or mankind in general 'who know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.' If it be thought science that will endure examination, we shall know more of the justness of the supposition when time has tested it. But it may be

wise to be jealous beforehand of a method of philosophizing in religion, which forsakes facts and experience for hypothesis and conjecture. It has never yet turned out well in history; and, if signs do not deceive us, Christendom is now learning its futility at a vast expense and waste of souls."

He thinks the defection from the truth in New England is extensive:

"I fear Professor Park judges truly that the current of theological opinions is running in the 'new' channels. I fear he would be found, if occasion should serve, in the centre of a larger 'coterie' than these good men imagine. For it is true that the Assembly's Catechism has mostly ceased from the families, schools, and churches of New England. It is true that wanton hands have marred that venerable digest itself, and few care to wipe the infamy away. It is true that we are altering our confessions and covenants, our psalms and hymns, and our style of worship in general, to suit a more highly illuminated state of the public mind. It is true that our whirling civilization is sensibly overcoming those habits of severe thought, of patient discrimination, of exact discipline, and earnest devotion, which are necessary to a just appreciation of the theology of the fathers. It is true that our venerable 'standing order' is broken up by innumerable greedy and licentious sects that substitute philanthropy for religion, and reform for the ordinances of God; and that, although these successively wither and disappear, new varieties are ever budding, and the constant waste that is going on is with equal constancy repaired. Such unequivocal signs exist that a great change is coming over New England. And there is plenary evidence that this change is referable to a period when our theology was diverted into a speculative channel, when its learned teachers began to light their torch at the altar of the imaginative reason, and, in their circuits after divine knowledge, went up to Alexandria and Athens rather than to Jerusalem. All this looks so much like reality that I would not risk much on a contrary supposition. Nor would it be safe to predict, that this change will not become more general and perpetual. But Professor Park may yet reckon too confidently on numbers. There are 'seven thousand' men who have not bowed to this Baal of a speculative idolatry. There are many old prophets who are mindful of what God did for his people in the waters and the wilderness; and sons of the prophets, still held in the covenant, who know their right hand from the left. 'The foundation of God standeth sure.'"

The great question he holds at issue is, the question between those who truly receive the Scriptures as the word of God; and the neologists who reject their inspiration and bend them into harmony with

their own conceptions or affections; and what is especially needed is a just system of interpretation.

"On questions of mere fiction and imagination the public curiosity has been tasked till it is exhausted. It is now asleep in general. It can be roused, not, as some pretend, by higher developments of the new science, but only by a different issue between the new and old. New England is driven to a new study; not philology, nor theology, nor rhetoric, nor history, as these have hitherto been pursued, each one on its own account, and for its own sake, and each one magnifying itself against the rest; but all these together, and every other related science, in reference to a knowledge which most concerns the receivers of a revelation from God; namely, *interpretation*. It will be of little avail to ask, hereafter, what good and learned men have imagined about the kingdom of God, what it is, or ought to be, according to the speculations of human wisdom, or how most fit, and reasonable, and productive of the greatest happiness,—questions all beyond the scope of the human faculties;—but what God, in his infinite and holy sovereignty, has ordained? We are approaching the most important, as it will be also the most trying of all alternatives, God or man; text, or commentary; what man's wisdom teacheth, or the Holy Ghost teacheth. It cannot be evaded."

He pays, in the following passage, a just and beautiful tribute to Dr. Woods:

"I seem to hear another voice, yet a living voice, of another prophet of the Edwardean school, its greatest representative and expounder. Of him we never lost sight beneath the waters, or among the clouds. His atmosphere has ever been fresh, serene, and clear. He has been known to fly; but only by mistake, and when excited to pursue the birds of prey that were stooping upon the flocks. But he was not made for such an exercise. His work lay not in the heights, but depths; not among the fluttering forms, but the profound essences of truth; and his wings are now folded, to be spread, as we trust, no more, but, at the command of God, in the pure atmosphere of heaven. I seem to hear him, in a soothing voice, a voice which has sometimes soothed when it should have thundered, respond to the dying accents of his fellow-laborer, 'Yes! interpretation! we must better know what God hath spoken, according to the letter which his wisdom hath indited, and by the spirit which proceedeth forth to believing minds, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.' I seem to see him planted on the dogmatic truths which he has loved, laying off the polemic harness in which he has fought a good fight, and saying 'Yes! interpretation, consistent interpretation! the same laws for doctrine, precept, history, prophecy, devo-

tion, for they are all *facts* declared from heaven, and profitable for the man of God.' As new lines of light, evolved by a consistent interpretation, strike his admiring vision, I seem to hear him whisper, 'How glorious! and we have not adequately seen it! In discussing the power of man, we have lost sight, in measure, of the great power of God!' while, with glistening eyes, and face radiant with hope, he looks out upon the kingdom that is to come, and the glory that is to be revealed."

We recommend this Letter to the consideration of each of the theological parties whom it respects. It merits their profoundest attention. Though many may not acquiesce in all its views, there are few probably who will not feel that a large share of them are indisputably just; and they express the judgment of one who is not only able and learned, but has the rare merit of independence, fidelity to his principles, and candor towards those from whom he dissents.

5. PHENOMENA OF THE SPIRITUAL RAPPINGS; a Revival of the Ancient Practice of Necromancy or Demonology and Witchcraft. Boston: J. V. Himes. 1852.

THE author of this work regards the effects, in the main, which are ascribed by the originators and disciples of this new demonology to disembodied spirits, as "real and supernatural," but the work of the lost and malignant; and holds that the agency they are exerting in misleading those who take them as their guides, is that which is symbolized by the unclean spirits that proceeded from the mouth of the dragon, the wild beast, and the false prophet.

We regard the whole of the extraordinary phenomena, such as the movement of material bodies, and the pretended responses from disembodied spirits, as cheats. They are no more extraordinary, we take it, than many of the marvels of Anderson, Blitz, and other professors of magic, or sleight-of-hand arts. Whenever their causes are ascertained, we doubt not that those who have thought them supernatural will find they have been wholly deceived.

But whatever their cause may be, there clearly is no evidence that they are the work of disembodied spirits. There is no direct supernatural proof that spirits are the authors of the sounds, and the movements of furniture and other material bodies, that are ascribed to them. There is nothing to support the supposition except the testimony of the operators or interpreters of the sounds and other phenomena. But they cannot have any knowledge of the agency of spirits in producing those effects, any more than other spectators; and

have shown, in a great number of instances, by their false testimony, that they are not entitled to any reliance.

It is inconsistent with the nature of disembodied spirits, as far as we have any knowledge of them, to suppose that they can produce effects on material things, by their mere volition—the only mode in which they can be supposed to act on them—such as men in the body can produce only by their muscles.

And, finally, if spirits possessed the power of working such effects, it is not credible that they would be contented to waste it in the production of effects so equivocal and of so little adaptation to the moral ends they would seek in them. If they were able by a mere volition to give existence to such phenomena, they might, undoubtedly, employ their powers in forms immensely more adapted to awake the curiosity and command the faith of men, and lead scores to destruction where they now dupe and ruin one. Who can believe they would choose such agents as those who now conduct the affair, or select such a grade of phenomena, if armed with such an absolute control of all the objects and forces in the physical world? We, therefore, cannot suppose that these deceivers are of the class who are represented by the unclean spirits of the Apocalypse.

The subject is entitled to a more careful consideration than it has received from the ministers of religion. The delusion is spreading with astounding rapidity, and is likely to gather new converts as readily, for aught we see, hereafter, as it has heretofore. It is highly desirable that it should be fully investigated by competent persons, and the mode of the deception so thoroughly ascertained and exposed, as to put an end to the cheat.

The writer gives, in connexion with his views on this subject, a brief exposition of Rev. xv.—xviii.; much of which is correct, we think, and well stated. We cannot regard the false prophet, however, as the representative of the Mahomedan power, or think that Babylon the Great has already fallen.

6. **WHEAT OR CHAFF.** By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A. New York : R. Carter & Brothers. 1852.

MR. RYLE'S object is clearly to distinguish the characteristics of the renewed from those of the unrenewed mind, show the separation of the two classes that is to take place at Christ's advent, and enforce the necessity of watchfulness, self-examination, a preparation for his coming, and fidelity in all the duties of life; and he treats these topics in a manner unusually adapted to rouse and interest the

reader. None can peruse it without instruction and impression; and it is especially suited to be useful to those who are in danger of being misled by works, now so current, which exhibit religion as little else than a vague and flashy sentimentalism.

7. **ELEMENTARY LATIN GRAMMAR AND EXERCISES**; of the Classical Series, edited by Drs. Schmitz & Zumpt. By Dr. Leonard Schmitz, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School, Edinburgh. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. 1852.

THIS is essentially an abridgment of Zumpt's Latin Grammar, and contains all of that excellent work that is necessary to the learner to gain a knowledge of the principal features of the language. It is on good paper, in fair type, of convenient size; and in every respect admirably fitted for the use of beginners.

8. **CHARGES TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF PENNSYLVANIA**, delivered at the opening of the Conventions, May, 1851, and 1852. By the Right Rev. A. Potter, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia: 1852.

THESE are timely and excellent charges on the duty of making the word of God the great subject of study, and implicitly following its teachings in contradistinction alike from tradition, and from the commands and speculations of men. This Bishop Potter regards as now eminently obligatory, from the extraordinary errors and dangers of the period. "There are signs of impending and eventful changes. There are fearful struggles between capital and labor—between liberty and order—between church-authority and private judgment—between spiritualism and formalism—between asceticism and sensuality—between fatalism and freedom—between mysticism and dogmatism—between belief and unbelief. For these, then, let us be prepared by diligent communion with this word, whose wisdom alone can be our guide."

. Notices of other works are postponed till the next number.

THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

VOLUME V.

JANUARY, 1853.

NUMBER III.

ART. I.—THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY AND ITS CONNECTED SCIENCES. By Edward Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1851.

BY THE EDITOR.

DR. HITCHCOCK has long been one of the most laborious cultivators and popular teachers of geology in our country. Naturally ardent, ambitious of success in whatever he undertakes, and excited by the prospect of novel and brilliant discoveries, he has pursued his profession with an ardor approaching to enthusiasm, and has gained in it, by his investigations of the strata of Massachusetts, his lectures, and his publications, a highly flattering rank. As he is a clergyman and professor of natural theology in the institution of which he is president, and as his speculations in respect to the age and history of the earth are regarded by many in the sacred office and others as at war with the teachings of the Scriptures, he has naturally felt desirous to free them from that objection, and has accordingly made it the object of several of his essays or treatises to reconcile the history of the creation in Genesis with his theory; and

that is especially his aim in this volume. Of the accuracy of the views he advances, he has the most undoubting conviction. He regards geology as, in an eminent sense, a science, founded on indubitable principles. He holds that the great speculative conclusions which he has reached are demonstrated by the most certain and ample evidences, and deems it as rash and unphilosophical to reject or doubt them as it were to question the great truths of astronomy that are deduced from the law of gravitation; maintains that they should be taken as a key to the meaning of the narrative in Genesis of the creation; holds that they are the only means by which its genuine import can be discerned; and regards the disbelief and disapprobation with which many reject them as having their ground in ignorance, prejudice, or bigotry. He holds that geology, according to his construction of it, instead of being hostile to revelation, is its most genial and effective auxiliary, and reflects a clearer and more dazzling light on the attributes and purposes of God than any other branch of knowledge; and claims that it ought for that reason to be a subject of study in schools and academies, and made familiar in their early years to those universally who enjoy the benefits of education.

The favorable reception which his volume has met from critics and readers, and the large influence it is exerting, render the question whether his views are legitimate or not one of much interest. If they are just, they assuredly ought to be freed from some very formidable difficulties with which they are now embarrassed, and verified by more decisive evidence. If they are wrong, they cannot but prove in a high degree mischievous, and ought to be confuted and abandoned.

What, then, is their character? Is geology, as he exhibits it, a science of such indisputable principles as he alleges? Are the assumptions on which he proceeds, and the speculative conclusions which he has adopted, founded on such indubitable evidence as he supposes? Are his theories unobnoxious to the charge of contradicting the teachings of the Scriptures? Can they with propriety be taken as a key to the meaning of the sacred writings? Are they entitled to the credit of reflecting so peculiar and brilliant a light as he represents on the doctrines of natural theology?

We certainly know of no grounds on which an affirmative answer can be given to these questions. We should find ourselves perplexed with the most formidable obstacles were we to attempt to maintain his system. He is, in our judgment, altogether mistaken. We believe his theory is not only unsupported by any adequate evidence, but is at open war alike with the laws of nature and the teachings of revelation; and that, instead of an auxiliary to Christianity, it must naturally prove, very much in proportion to the influence it exerts, the means of weakening the faith of its readers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and leading them to substitute a religion of speculation and fancy for that of the Bible. Under this persuasion, we propose to state some of the principal objections to which it seems to us to be open, and shall rely on the candor and love of truth which he and other geologists of the rank to which he belongs, are accustomed to exhibit, to give them the consideration to which they are entitled.

We dissent at the outset from the representation he gives of the writers who have from time to time questioned the accuracy of the theory he entertains, and urged as a fatal objection to it, the contradiction which it presents to the Scriptural history of the creation. He exhibits them universally as not only altogether mistaken, profoundly ignorant of the subject, and the victims of prejudice, but as animated by a bigoted and malevolent spirit. He says:—

“Men of respectable ability and decided friends of revelation, having got fully impressed with the belief that the views of geologists are hostile to the Bible, have set themselves to the examination of their writings, *not so much with a view of understanding the subject*, as of finding contradictions and untenable positions. The next step has been to write a book against geology, abounding, as we might expect from men of warm temperament, of such prejudices, and without a *practical* knowledge of geology, with striking misapprehensions of facts and opinions, with positive and dogmatic assertions, with severe personal insinuations, great ignorance of correct reasoning in geology, and the substitution of wild and extravagant hypotheses for geological theories.”—P. 17.

This had its origin, we fear, in a measure, in the very pre-

judice and party feeling which he ascribes to those writers; and is neither just to them nor to the reader, whom it is adapted to prepossess with a distrust of those who venture to question the truth of the geological theory, as of course ignorant and malevolent. We shall not undertake to apologize for the faults, either of opinion, temper, or style, into which those writers fell. They are undoubtedly numerous and grave. Their error, however, lay not in their "belief that the views of geologists are hostile to the Bible," but in their not selecting the proper method of demonstrating that that is their character. If, in place of wasting their labor in a large degree on points of subordinate consequence, they had on the one hand thoroughly analysed the theory, and pointed out the fact, that instead of being based on indisputable truths, it is founded on mere assumptions that are neither proved nor consistent with the laws of matter, they would have effectually confuted it; and had they, on the other hand, unfolded the full import of the record of the creation in Genesis, they would have shown that the doctrine of the theory can never be reconciled with that narrative. But however unfortunately they missed their aim by not discerning the method by which it was to be attained, they are not deserving of the reproaches with which Dr. H. assails them. Instead, they are entitled to credit for pointing out the error of the geological theory in relation to the origin of the world, and endeavoring to vindicate the truth of the Scriptural history respecting it. Nor are they of so low a rank as speculatists and reasoners, as Dr. H. represents. Great as their mistakes are, they are not greater than those into which the geologists themselves have fallen; nor are the hypotheses and assumptions which they advance either more baseless or absurd than those which form the staple of the theory which Dr. H. himself advances. The truth is, the subject has been sadly misunderstood by both parties. Instead, therefore, of endeavoring to beat down those who object to their theory by imputations of ignorance, prejudice, and bigotry, as geologists have been too much inclined to do, and attempting to win the confidence of their readers by claiming the sanction of science for their doctrines, it would be wiser in them calmly to consider the objections of their opponents, and avail themselves of the aid which they fur-

nish to free their theory from the great errors with which it is indisputably embarrassed.

Nor is it peculiar to the opponents of the theory that they have missed the great points on which the controversy turns, and failed to furnish their readers with the means of a just judgment respecting it. That is equally a fault of geologists, and of Dr. Hitchcock himself in the volume under consideration. To enable his readers to form a just estimate of the subject, he should have stated clearly what the real questions are that are at issue; and in order to do that, he should have pointed out the distinction between practical and speculative geology, and apprised them that the great facts of the science, which belong exclusively to the former, are not involved in the controversy respecting the age of the world; that the doctrine of its great antiquity belongs entirely to the speculative branch of the science, and is founded wholly, not on the nature, bulk, or condition of the strata, but on mere assumptions or hypotheses respecting the sources from which their elements were drawn, and the agents and processes to which they owe their formation; and that consequently the real point in debate is, simply whether those assumptions and hypotheses are consistent with the laws of matter, and demonstrated, or demonstrable, by satisfactory evidence. Not a hint, however, of this important fact has fallen from his pen. He conducts his whole discussion as though the question at issue respected the facts of the strata that are within the sphere of our observation, and are ascertained and demonstrated by the eye and hand: not mere hypotheses or assumptions respecting the causes of those facts, or the mode of their production. "The substitution of wild and extravagant hypotheses for geological theories"—*facts*, he probably means—he represents as the fault exclusively of those who have assailed "the views" which "geologists" entertain. No conception, therefore, of the ground on which the question in debate really turns would ever be gained by those who take him as a guide. They would naturally suppose it depends wholly on the question whether the great facts of the strata that lie within our reach and are determinable by the eye and hand, are what geologists represent them to be; and that the denial accordingly of

their theory of the age of the earth, is a denial of those facts. We do not suppose by any means that Dr. Hitchcock thus intentionally concealed the real points that are at issue, and gave a false view of the ground of his theory, in order to escape difficulties he felt unwilling to meet, and beguile his readers into an assent to his theory, to which a just exhibition of the subject would have been an obstacle. He presented the question, undoubtedly, in the attitude in which he contemplates it. He has himself fallen into the very mistake into which his representations are adapted to lead others; nor is it peculiar to him, but is common to the whole body of geologists who hold the doctrine of the great age of the earth. Instead, therefore, of having so thoroughly mastered the subject as he represents, both he and they are involved in the most extraordinary misconceptions of it, and give as emphatic proofs of "striking" errors in respect to "facts and opinions," "great ignorance of correct reasoning in geology," and a disposition to "substitute wild and extravagant hypotheses" for facts, as are exhibited by Penn, Fairholm, Young, Cole, Wilson, or any of the other opponents of his theory whom he reproaches with those faults.

He ascribes to those writers, moreover, a far higher influence than they have ever exerted. He represents it as the effect of their writings that the religious, generally, are so reluctant to assent to the geological theory respecting the age of the world. He says:—

"The warm zeal displayed and doubtless felt by these writers for the Bible; their familiar reference to eminent geological authors, as if they understood them; the skill in philology which they frequently exhibit; and the want of a widespread and accurate knowledge of geology in the community, have given to their works a far more extensive circulation than those works have had that view geology as illustrating and not opposing revelation. The consequence is, that the public mind is possessed of many prejudices unfavorable to the religious bearings of geology, and unfavorable to an impartial examination of its claims."—Pp. 18, 19.

This, we doubt not, is altogether mistaken. The objections, in ninety-nine cases in a hundred, that are felt to the doctrines of the theory, have their origin in the point-blank contradiction which it presents to the Mosaic history of the

creation, and rise spontaneously and necessarily in the minds of those who entertain them.

The works to which he refers have had indeed but a very limited circulation in this country. Mr. Fairholm's is the only one among them, as far as we are aware, that has been republished here. We doubt whether Dr. Hitchcock can find a hundred individuals in the country, even including the geologists themselves, who ever read Penn's volumes, or those of Cole, Young, Nolan, or Wilson. We should not be at all surprised, so rarely are they met with, should it have happened that he has not himself read them. The truth is, that the geologists here, so far from having had to contend with a powerful phalanx of writers, have scarcely had any opponents; and have not only been allowed to lecture and publish, almost without obstruction, but have enjoyed the direct support, in a very large degree, of both the secular and religious press. No complaint could be more groundless and unjust than that they have had to encounter illiberal opposition. The dispositions manifested towards them generally, have been eminently friendly. The extraordinary and brilliant discoveries made by the cultivators of the science abroad especially, and the important benefits that result from them to the arts, early invested the subject with unusual interest to all classes, excited an eager desire to become acquainted with its leading facts, and secured to those who lectured on it, large and attentive audiences, and to those who published, numerous readers. The opposition with which they have had to contend, had its origin accordingly, not in the objections of those foreign writers, but solely in the contradictions presented by their speculations to the teachings of the Scriptures; and the reason that they have not silenced their opponents is solely, that they have not freed their theory from that objection.

That geology, indeed, instead of an exact science, is yet in a very crude state, and that Dr. Hitchcock himself, in place of having thoroughly mastered its great questions, has but very inadequate and mistaken views respecting them, is indicated by the errors into which he has fallen in respect to what he represents as the principles of the science. He says, in reference to the prejudices which he supposes to prevail in regard to it:

"Under these circumstances, all that I can do is to state what I apprehend to be the established principles of the science that have a bearing upon religious truth, and refer my hearers to standard works on the subject for proof that they are true. If any will not take the trouble to examine the proof, I trust they will have candor and impartiality enough not to deny my positions."—P. 19.

He thus implies that the propositions he was about to state are "established *principles* of the science," from which the conclusion respecting the age of the world, that is rejected by his opponents, is deduced by a scientific process; and that if his positions are not denied, there can be no consistent denial of the theory which he professedly founds on them. They are not, however, such principles. Practical geology indeed has no principles. It consists of facts that are ascertained by the eye, or touch, exclusively, not by a mathematical or logical process, from self-evident axioms, or abstract truths. Nor has theoretical geology, any established principles, like those of geometry, astronomy, and other similar branches of knowledge. In astronomy, for example, the laws of gravity and motion enable the inquirer to reason back from the present position of the earth in relation to the other planetary bodies and the sun, to the position it occupied in relation to them, at any past epoch. But theoretical geology has no such principles by which the investigator can reason back from the present structure of the earth's crust, and determine what the condition was originally of the elements of which it consists; where they were deposited immediately anterior to their transference to the localities they now occupy; what the processes were by which they were wrought into their present forms; and what the periods were that were occupied by those processes. All our knowledge of those subjects that is gained by the study of the globe itself, in contradistinction from the teachings of revelation, is acquired by the examination of the surface of the earth, and notice of the agents that are now producing changes in it, and is the result of observation, not reasoned out from general physical laws, or abstract propositions. The views we adopt that lie beyond that circle of observation, are views of probabilities only, or possibilities, not certainties, demonstrated like the conclu-

sions in astronomy by a scientific process. Dr. Hitchcock's representation, therefore, that the science has such "established principles," is altogether mistaken, and is adapted wholly to mislead his readers. The positions indeed which he proceeds to state under that name, instead of geological principles, are nothing more, with one or two exceptions, than mere facts, or supposed facts of the science, and inferences he deduces from them respecting the period occupied in the formation of the strata, and the age of the world. Thus, the first which he presents, instead of a principle, he himself denominates a conclusion.

"The first important *conclusion* to which every careful *observer* will come is, that the rocks of all sorts which compose the present crust of the globe, so far as it has been explored, at least to the depth of several miles, *appear* to have been the result of second causes; that is, they are now in a different state from that in which they were originally created."—P. 19.

This, instead of a scientific principle, is thus a mere "conclusion," and a conclusion obtained by the *observation of appearances*, and furnishes no basis for an inference respecting the sources from which the materials of the rocks were derived, or the period which was occupied in their construction.

His fourth position is at an equal distance from a scientific principle.

"It is *demonstrated* that the present continents of the globe, with perhaps the exception of some of the highest mountains, have for a long period constituted the bottom of the ocean, and have been subsequently either elevated into their present position, or the waters have been drained off from their surface. This is probably the most important *principle* in geology; and though regarded with much scepticism by many, it is as satisfactorily proved as any principle of physical science not resting on mathematical demonstration."—P. 21.

But this, instead of a "principle of geology," is a mere fact, and a fact, by his own representation, that is ascertained by observation; not deduced by a scientific process. In place of a principle of theoretical geology by which the phenomena of the earth's crust are to be solved, it is itself one of the facts which it is the express office of that branch

of the science to explain. His sixth position is still more unworthy of the rank of a principle of the science.

"The fossiliferous rocks, or such as contain animals and plants, are not less than six or seven miles in perpendicular thickness, and are composed of hundreds of alternating layers of different kinds, all of which appear to have been deposited, just as rocks are now forming, at the bottom of lakes and seas; and hence, *their deposition must have occupied an immense period of time.* Even if we admit that this deposition went on in particular places much faster than at present, a variety of facts forbids the supposition that this was the general mode of their formation."—P. 21.

This position thus, instead of a principle, consists, first, of the two facts that the fossiliferous rocks are of great thickness, and that they are composed of a great number of layers; next, of the supposed or asserted fact, that they "appear" to have been deposited just as rocks are now forming; and lastly, of the inference from this supposed and those real facts, of the period which their deposition occupied. Can anything transcend the misapprehension Dr. Hitchcock indicates in denominating this complication of fact, appearance, and inference, a principle of the science? In place of a principle by which the great problems of theoretical geology are to be explained, they are themselves the identical facts and problems which it is the office of that branch of the science to resolve.

Of the same character are his seventh, eighth, and ninth imagined principles.

"The remains of animals and plants found in the earth are not mingled confusedly together, but are found arranged, for the most part, in as much order as the drawers of a well regulated cabinet. In general, they appear to have lived and died on or near the spots where they are now found; and as countless millions of these remains are often found piled together so as to form almost entire mountains, *the periods requisite for their formation must have been immensely long, as was taught in the preceding proposition.*

"Still further confirmation of the same important *principle* is found in the well established *fact*, that there have been upon the globe, previous to the existing races, not less than five distinct periods of organized existence; that is, five great groups of animals and plants,

so completely independent that no species whatever is found in more than one of them, have lived and successively passed away before the creation of the races that now occupy the surface. Other standard writers make the number of these periods as many as twelve. Comparative anatomy testifies that, so unlike in structure were these different groups, that they could not have co-existed in the same climate and other external circumstances.

"In the earliest times in which animals and plants lived, the climate over the whole globe *appears* to have been as warm as, or even warmer than, it is now between the tropics; and the slow change from warmer to colder *appears* to have been the chief cause of the successive destruction of the different races; and new ones were created, better adapted to the altered condition of the globe; and yet each group *seems* to have occupied the globe through a period of great length; so that we have here another evidence of the vast cycles of duration that must have rolled away ever since the earth became a habitable globe."—Pp. 21, 22.

Can any one fail to see that the mixture of fact, appearance, opinion, and inference of which these propositions consist, are not scientific principles? These facts and appearances are the very things which it is the business of theoretical geology to resolve; not maxims or laws by which the great problems of that branch of the science are to be determined—namely, whence it was that the materials of which the strata consist were derived; what the agents and processes were by which they were transferred to their present localities, and wrought into their present forms; and what the periods were that were occupied in their construction.

We add two more out of his seventeen "principles."

"The surface of the earth has undergone an enormous amount of erosion by the action of the ocean, the rivers, and the atmosphere. The ocean has worn away the solid rock in some parts of the world, not less than ten thousand feet in depth, and rivers have cut channels through the hardest strata hundreds of feet deep and several miles long; both of which effects demand periods inconceivably long.

"At a comparatively recent date, northern and southern regions have been swept over and worn down by the joint action of ice and water, the force in general having been directed towards the equator."—Pp. 23, 24.

These, again, instead of theoretical principles, are mere facts of practical geology, which it is the office of the theoretical branch to account for on scientific principles, that is, in other words, in consistency with the nature of the agents and the peculiarities of the conditions under which these effects were brought into existence. He has, thus, in each of these "positions," and nearly all his others, confounded the facts of the earth's crust, which are to be explained, with the scientific principles on which their explanation is to be wrought out. The only propositions in his series that can in even a vague sense be considered as principles, are the following.

"The same general laws appear to have always prevailed on the globe, and to have controlled the changes that have taken place on and within it. We come to no spot, in the history of the rocks, in which a system different from that which now prevails appears to have existed. Great peculiarities in the structure of animals and plants do indeed occur, as well as changes on a scale of magnitude unknown at present; but this was only a wise adaptation to peculiar circumstances, and not an infringement of the general law.

"The geological changes which the earth has undergone and is now undergoing, appear to have been the result of the same agencies, viz. heat and water."—Pp. 20, 21.

But these are rather facts or truths that are to be borne in mind, in speculating respecting the formation of the earth's crust, than principles by which its construction is to be explained. It is by the agents or forces by which changes are wrought in the earth's surface, and the laws by which those forces are governed, of the latter of which he gives no statement—that the phenomena of the strata are to be accounted for; not by the mere fact that those forces are the same as are now effecting changes on the surface, and that their laws have been the same in all past ages as those that now control them. Moreover, besides the agents he enumerates, "heat and water"—the forces of chemistry, electricity, and magnetism—unless they are considered as included in the former,—and of gravity, have had an important agency in the formation of the earth's surface.

He has thus, through the whole series of his propositions,

entirely missed the point at which he was professedly aiming. Can any more decisive evidence be desired that geology, as he treats it, is not such an exact and demonstrative science as he represents it? Can more unanswerable proofs be needed than he gives in this mistake of facts, appearances, and inferences for theoretic principles, that instead of thoroughly comprehending the subject, his views are extremely vague and unphilosophic?

This is further confirmed by the consideration, that his whole theoretical system rests, not on the facts of the science, but on suppositions or assumptions that not only cannot be proved, but are in contradiction to the laws themselves of matter. He proceeds on the hypothesis commonly entertained by geologists, that the earth existed originally either in the form of gas, or in fusion from intense heat; that as it gradually cooled the molten ocean became covered with a coat of granite, which was at length thrown up in mountain ranges and continents; and that it was by their disintegration and transportation to the ocean that the present strata of the globe were formed. Yet this, he admits, is nothing more than an hypothesis.

"There is no little reason to believe that, previous to the formation of the stratified rocks, the earth passed through changes that required vast periods of time, by which it was gradually brought into a habitable state. It is even believed that one of its earliest conditions was that of vapor; that gradually condensing, it became a melted globe of fire, and that as it gradually cooled, a crust formed over its surface; and so at last it became habitable. *All this is indeed hypothesis*; and therefore I do not place it in the same rank as the other proofs of the earth's antiquity, already adduced. Still this hypothesis has so much evidence in its favor, that not a few of the ablest and most cautious philosophers of the present day have adopted it, and if it be indeed true, it throws back the creation of the universe to a period remote beyond calculation or conception."—P. 60.

"All this" is thus, by his own concession, mere "hypothesis." But it is altogether unphilosophical and absurd to attempt to build a demonstrative science on such a sheer supposition, and to treat the conclusion that is founded on it, as a fact or truth that is proved "by the strictest rules of the

Baconian philosophy." The inference that has nothing more than such an hypothesis for its basis, cannot possibly have any higher certainty or authority than the conjectural premise from which it is deduced. Yet this hypothesis he in fact makes the foundation of his whole theory respecting the age of the world; and he proceeds on it through most of his reasonings, as an absolute certainty instead of a mere supposition. Thus he says, in a subsequent page:

"Geology teaches that the time has been when the earth existed as a molten mass of matter, and therefore all the animals and plants now existing upon its surface, and all those buried in its rocky strata, must have had a beginning, or have been created. . . . So many and so decisive are the facts which point to the original igneous fluidity of the globe, that no competent judge thinks of doubting that all the matter of which it is composed, certainly its crust, has some time or other been in that state. . . .

"To prove the original igneous fluidity of the globe, we might have adopted another course of argument. All will admit that the present temperature of the interior of the earth is far more elevated than that of the surrounding planetary spaces. The inevitable result is, from the known laws of heat, that its radiation into the celestial spaces is constantly going on, and consequently the earth's temperature is being constantly lowered. Who can tell us now when this process of refrigeration commenced? If no one, then there must have been a time when the heat was great enough to fuse the whole globe. And the facts already stated confirm such an inference; for all the efforts hitherto made to show that the earth may be passing through regions of various temperatures, in its march around the centre of centres, amount to nothing more than dreamy conjectures.

"In order to feel the force of this argument, sustained by so many facts in geology, just picture to yourselves this vast globe as a mass of liquid fire. From such a world everything organic must have been excluded, and every thing combustible consumed, and only such combinations of matter have existed as incandescent heat could not decompose."—Pp. 162-164.

His supposititious globe of "liquid fire" is thus converted by him into a real one; its reality is represented as demonstrated by a great variety of evidences; and it is made the basis of his theory respecting the formation of the strata, and the great age of the earth. But this hypothesis of the origi-

nal fusion of the globe, its investiture with a covering of granite by the radiation of the heat, the elevation of a portion of that granite surface into continents and islands, and the formation of the strata by their disintegration and the transference of their detritus to the ocean, is not only an altogether inadequate basis for a demonstrative theory of the age of the earth, but is itself inconsistent in all its steps with the laws of matter, and a palpable and consummate solecism.

In the first place, to say nothing of the hypothesis that the earth in its first condition was a vast ocean of gas—which Dr. H. does not fully adopt, and which is embarrassed by insuperable difficulties—the supposition that it was created in a state of fusion from heat, is a contradiction to nature. For, as we have shown in a former article, fusion is a condition of matter that results from an action of its particles or elements on each other, as in many chemical processes, and in combustion, by which heat that had before been latent in it, is developed. It implies the previous existence, therefore, of its elements in a different state. To suppose the world to have been created in a state of fusion, is as solecistical as it were to suppose a person created with a memory of some mental process of which he had not been the subject, or to conceive of persons as born the children of individuals who are not their parents, which is against the laws of nature. It is a gross self-contradiction to suppose anything to be produced by a creative fiat in a state, which, according to the established constitution of matter, can only result from a previous existence in a different condition. All the other parts of that hypothesis are equally at war with the laws of matter. Such is the formation of a crust of granite over the molten ocean. He says:—

“If we suppose the earth originally to have been merely a diffused mass of vapor, like comets or nebulae, I can conceive how, by the operation of such natural laws as now exist, it might have been condensed into a solid globe; into a melted state indeed, from the amount of heat extricated in the condensation. *Those same laws might subsequently form over the molten mass a solid crust, which at length might be ridged and furrowed by the action of internal heat so as to form the basis of continents and the beds of oceans.* In due

time the vapors might condense so as to fill those basins with water, and by the mutual and alternate action of the waters above and the heat beneath, the rocks might be comminuted, so as to form the basis of soils. So far might the arrangements of the world have proceeded by natural laws."—P. 339.

But the laws to which the matter of the globe is subjected, would have rendered the formation of a crust upon such a fiery ocean impossible. For as all substances occupy a larger space when in a state of fusion, than when solidified, had any particles or small portions of the surface become crystallized into granite, as by that process their bulk would have diminished, and their density become greater than that of the molten ocean on which they were formed, they would have instantly sunk by their superior weight into the depths of the fiery sea; and though they would have been again fused, yet as all other particles or masses that might have been subsequently crystallized, would have sunk in like manner into the abysses of the molten ocean, the result would have been that those abysses would have been the scenes of the first permanent solidification, and the surface of the globe the last.

Let us suppose, however, that that would not have so immediately taken place, but that the first crystallized portions would have been again fused ere they had descended far beneath the surface, and that the effect of the descent of those particles or small bodies would have been to cool the exterior of the molten ocean to the depth of a number of feet, and convert it at length into a solid stratum; the agencies to which it would have been subjected, would nevertheless have speedily broken it up into fragments, and rendered its descent inevitable into the liquid abysses beneath. For the face of such a liquid globe would not have been at rest. It would, in the first place, have been subject to tides, like our ocean, that would have kept its surface in perpetual fluctuation; and in the next place, the intense heat driving the air in contact with the fiery flood by expansion into the higher regions, and causing the descent of colder air into its place, would have generated tempests and whirlwinds of such resistless violence as would have thrown the molten ocean into the wildest commotion, while the supposed gra-

nite crust was forming, and rent and dashed it into fragments, which by their great size the force of gravity would have borne to a far greater depth in the flood beneath, or they would have become re-fused. The disturbing effect of such a fiery sea on the atmosphere, is exemplified in a measure by the furious tornadoes and whirlwinds that are generated by the molten streams that are thrown up from the volcanoes on Hawaii.

"The intense heat of the fountain and stream of lava caused an influx of cool air from every quarter; this created *terrific whirlwinds* which, constantly stalking about like so many sentinels, bade defiance to the daring visitor. These were the most dangerous of anything about the volcano. Sometimes we were compelled to prostrate ourselves for safety. Once we ventured within about a quarter of a mile of the great jet; soon one of the most terrific whirlwinds formed at the crater, and advanced straight towards us, threatening us with instant ruin; but, fortunately for us, it spent its force and turned to the right, leaving us to make a rapid retreat.

"We saw a similar one whirling round the jet, and concealing it with a dense cloud of ashes, as if engaged in a furious combat. The two contending elements presented a most wonderful spectacle. When the strife ceased, the fountain appeared in constant action, as though nothing had occurred. Clouds approaching the volcano were driven back, and set moving in wild confusion."—*Letter of H. Kinney, April, 1852, in the American Journal of Science, Sept. 1852, p. 258.*

Let us suppose, however, that such a granite crust, notwithstanding these obstacles, might have been formed; the theory will still be embarrassed by insuperable difficulties, inasmuch as no force would have existed beneath by which that crust could have been elevated into mountains and continents. Dr. Hitchcock indeed assumes that volcanic forces might naturally have existed in the interior by which the crystallized surface would have been thrown up into continents and mountains. He says:—

"You can conceive how a solid crust might have formed over the vast fiery ocean, by the simple radiation of heat; and then too, by natural laws, might the vapors have been condensed into oceans and clouds, while volcanic force within might have lifted up our continents and mountains above the flood."—P. 164.

But no such volcanic force, as was shown in the last number of the Journal, pp. 300-302, could exist in such a molten globe. By his own admission on the page we have just quoted, "from such a world everything organic must have been excluded, *and everything combustible consumed*, and only such combinations of matter have existed *as incandescent heat could not decompose*." There would have been nothing in it, therefore, that could undergo a further chemical action, by which additional latent heat could be developed; and thence nothing by which an expansive force could be generated to upheave the crystallized surface into continents and mountains. Had such a granite crust then been crystallized in the manner he supposes, it would necessarily, from the want of a disturbing agent beneath, have remained at the geological level at which it was formed, and could not have filled the office, therefore, which his theory assigns it, of furnishing by disintegration the materials of the present strata.

Let us, however, suppose that the requisite volcanic forces might have been generated in such a world; that such a granite crust might have been elevated into continents; and that they might have been disintegrated, transferred to the ocean, and wrought into our present strata; still, had the interior of the globe continued, as his theory represents, in a molten state, it is demonstrably certain that at the upheaval and dislocation of the strata which took place at the elevation of our present mountains, the fragments into which they were broken, would have sunk by their immense weight into the flood beneath, and their place at the surface been again occupied by the molten ocean. For, as many of these fragments are ten, twenty, thirty, forty, and perhaps fifty miles in length; and ten, twenty, thirty, and perhaps forty or fifty miles in breadth, while they are only of five, six, seven, or at the most ten or twelve miles in thickness, and they are turned up edge-wise or at a sharp angle, the base on which they rested at the moment of their assuming that position, was so narrow compared to their bulk, that had that base been a molten ocean, their weight so much greater, proportionally, than the resisting power of that ocean, would have borne them down headlong an immeasurable distance into the abyss beneath. The supposition that such vast masses

presenting so slight a surface to the sustaining element, should continue to float like ice upon water, as though they were immeasurably lighter than the molten lava beneath them, is as solecistical and absurd, as it were to suppose that if similar masses of granite were thrown upon our present oceans, they would swim instead of sinking, till they met a solid base.

It is certain, therefore, from the laws of nature, that on his hypothesis such a granite crust of the globe as he contemplates, could never have been formed; and thence that his system of theoretical geology which is founded on that hypothesis, is neither such a demonstrative science as he represents it, nor has the merit in any measure of truth, but is in an open conflict with the laws of matter, as it is with the word of God.

And, finally, this is confirmed by the utter fallacy and error of the arguments which he employs to demonstrate the great age of the world. He asks:—

"Does geology teach distinctly and uncontrovertibly, that the world must have existed during a long period prior to the existence of the races of organized beings that now occupy its surface?"

"To give a popular view of the evidence sustaining the affirmative of this question is no easy task. It needs a full and accurate acquaintance with the multiplied facts of geology, and what is still more rare, a familiarity with geological reasoning, in order to feel the full force of the arguments that prove the high antiquity of the globe. Yet, I know that I have a right to presume upon a high degree of scientific knowledge, and an accurate acquaintance with geology among those whom I address."—Pp. 50, 51.

What sort of "scientific knowledge" that is of which Dr. H. entertains so high an estimate, and what the kind of reasoning is by which his geological theory is sustained, the reader has some means of judging from the fact we have already pointed out, that his whole theoretical system is founded on a mere hypothesis, that is not only unsupported by the facts of the strata, and incapable of being proved, but is in open antagonism to the most essential and palpable laws of matter. Had Dr. H. been involved in the profoundest ignorance of chemistry, mechanics, and the gravitating power, could he have fallen into greater and more fatal blunders?

The exemplifications he proceeds to give of his "familiarity with geological reasoning," are not of a more creditable character. He says:—

"In the first place, I must recur to a *principle* already briefly stated in a former lecture, viz.: that a careful examination of the rocks presents irresistible evidence, that in their present condition, they are all the result of second causes; in other words, they are not now in the condition in which they were originally created. Some of these have been melted and reconsolidated, and crowded in between others, or spread over them. Others have been worn down into mud, sand, and gravel, by water and other agents, and again cemented together, after having enveloped multitudes of animals and plants, which are now imbedded as organic remains. In short, all known rocks appear to have been brought into their present state by chemical or mechanical agencies."—P. 51.

But these, instead of "a principle" by which the great antiquity which he ascribes to the earth is to be distinctly and uncontrovertibly "demonstrated," are the phenomena, or effects, for which he professes to give a scientific explanation, according to "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy." The mere consideration that they are the work of second causes, does not prove the point he attempts to establish by it. The question whether the vast space, which he supposes, was occupied in their production, depends on the nature of those causes, the condition of the materials of the strata on which they exerted their forces, and the scale on which they acted. He thus, in his first argument, confounds *the facts* he is to explain, with *the modes* in which they were brought into existence, and accordingly takes for granted the point which he professes to prove.

His next argument is a still worse specimen of "geological reasoning;" as, first, he is mistaken in the asserted fact on which he founds it; and next, that fact, if admitted, could yield no support to his conclusion. He says:—

"In the second place, processes are going on by which rocks are formed on a small scale, of the same character as those which constitute *the great mass of the earth*. Hence it is fair to infer that all the rocks were formed in a similar manner. Beds of gravel, for instance, are sometimes cemented together by heat, or iron, or lime, so as to resemble exactly the conglomerates found in mountain

masses among the ancient rocks. Clay is sometimes converted into slate by heat, as is soft marl into limestone by the same cause. In fact, we find causes now in operation that produce all the varieties of known rocks, except some of the oldest, which seem to need only a greater intensity in some of the causes now at work to produce them. By ascertaining the rate at which rocks are now forming, therefore, we can form some opinion as to the time requisite to produce those constituting the crust of the globe. If, for instance, we can determine how fast ponds, lakes, and oceans are filling up with mud, sand, and gravel, conveyed to their bottoms, we can judge of the period necessary to produce those rocks which appear to have been formed in a similar manner; and if there is any evidence that the process was more rapid in early times, we can make due allowance."—Pp. 51, 52.

But, in the first place, Dr. H. is wholly mistaken in representing that rocks are now forming like those of the principal strata, and in the same manner in which they were constructed. There is not, at least so far as we are aware, a particle of evidence to support that proposition. In order to verify it, he must show, not only that the same rocks in kind are now in the process of construction, but that they are forming on an equal scale, and in a similar alternation. Otherwise he has no ground for the inference that they are the product of the same agents acting in similar circumstances. But he cannot prove either of those conditions. He may, indeed, point to small masses of gravel that have become cemented by the infiltration of water charged with iron or lime; and to patches of certain species of limestone that have been formed, and are forming, where lime has been deposited and is depositing by calcareous springs, and by water that chafes and wears the surface of coral reefs; which present, however, no parallel to the strata. But he cannot point to any locality in which a series of gneiss, quartz rock, sandstone, and schist—or sandstone, limestone, and shale—has been formed, or is now forming; which he should, in order to verify his position: for if those differing strata are never now deposited in succession to each other in the same localities, how does it appear that the agents that are constructing small patches of some one of them might have been the agents under which that and all the other kinds that constitute the crust of the earth were formed?

The conditions in which the strata were deposited were plainly essentially different from those in which the rocks of the present time are constructing. Nor can he prove that a solitary stratum of rock of any kind is now forming, by the agents to which he refers their construction, over an area of more than a few hundred square rods. Their extension over spaces, like those over which the strata are spread, is not possible by the forces which transport and deposit the materials out of which they are built. The lime that is thrown up by springs cannot—from the chemical agencies to which it is subjected on its exposure to the atmosphere—be transported more than a few feet, or at most a few rods, ere it is thrown down and converted into travertine or some other species of brittle limestone. The particles and granules disintegrated from a coral reef, cannot be borne far by the breakers which loosen them, ere they fall into the interstices of the surface along which they are swept, or sink through the calm depths of the sea to the bottom, where they are never again disturbed by waves or currents. And the sand and mud that are borne down from the land by streams into lakes and seas are deposited immediately at their mouths, and instead of being subsequently borne off to greater distances, are beat back and kept there by the action of waves and tides. Not an instance can be designated, in which they are spread over more than a narrow area; and such deposits, moreover, are never converted into rock. The mixed ingredients of which they consist are not suitable to form either gneiss, quartz, sandstone, limestone, or shale. That a stratum of either of these species should now be formed at the bottom of the ocean, out of detritus borne down from the land by rivers, may safely be pronounced a physical impossibility.

But Dr. Hitchcock is not only thus altogether mistaken in respect to the alleged fact from which he argues, but if it were granted that rocks are now forming in the manner he avers, his inference that the strata that constitute the crust of the earth were constructed in that manner, would still be unauthorized; inasmuch as there were no similar sources from which their materials could have been derived. He proceeds, indeed, on the assumption that those strata were constructed out of the detritus of granite that was

crystallized on the surface of the globe when in a molten state, and subsequently thrown up into continents and islands. We have shown, however, that that assumption is not only altogether without proof, but is in every relation at war with the constitution of nature. It is in contradiction to the nature of fusion to suppose the globe to have been created in that state. Had it, after creation, been reduced to that state, no crust of granite could have been formed on the surface over a molten interior; and had such a crust been crystallized, no explosive forces could have existed within, that could have elevated it into mountains and continents, or raised it a hair's breadth from its original geological level. On Dr. H.'s hypothesis, therefore, no continents or rocks could have existed from the materials of which the strata could have been derived. The agents to which he assigns their construction were not only without any elements on which to exert their forces, but they themselves, so far as rivers, streams, and lakes were concerned, had no existence; inasmuch as continents are requisite in order to the being of lakes and rivers. If it be admitted, therefore, that rocks are now forming "on a small scale," it furnishes no ground whatever on his hypothesis for his assumption that the rocks of the strata were formed by the same processes; and consequently none for his inference, that vast periods were occupied in their construction. Can a more unfortunate predicament be imagined for one who insists so urgently on the necessity of "a full and accurate acquaintance with the multiplied facts of geology, and, what is still more rare, a familiarity with geological reasoning, in order to feel the full force of the arguments that prove the high antiquity of the globe?"

His next argument is built on the same false basis.

"In the third place, all the stratified rocks appear to have been formed out of the fragments of other rocks, worn down by the action of water and atmospheric agencies. This is particularly true of that large proportion of these rocks which contain the remains of animals and plants. The mud and gravel, of which these are mostly composed, *must have been worn from rocks previously existing*, and have been transported into lakes and the ocean, as the same process is now going on. There the animals and plants which died in the waters, and were transported thither by rivers, must have been

buried; next the rocks must have been hardened into stone by an admixture with lime or iron, or by internal heat; and finally have been raised above the waters, so as to become dry land. Beds of limestone are interstratified with those of shale, sandstone, and conglomerate; but these form only a small proportion of the whole; and besides, were mostly formed in an analogous manner, though by agencies more decidedly chemical.

"Now, for the most part, this process of forming rocks by the accumulation of mud, sand, and gravel, is very slow. In general, such accumulations at the bottom of lakes and the ocean, do not increase more than a few inches in a century. During violent floods, indeed, and in a few limited spots, the accumulation is much more rapid, as in the lake of Geneva, through which the Rhone, loaded with detritus from the Alps, passes, where a delta has been formed two miles long, and nine hundred feet thick, within eight hundred years. And occasionally such rapid depositions probably took place while the older rocks were in the course of formation. But in general, the work seems to have gone on as slowly as it usually does at present."—Pp. 52, 53.

He proceeds in this argument on the assumption that the materials of the strata were derived from the hypothetical continents, which he holds were formed by the elevation of a crust of granite, crystallized over the globe when in a state of fusion. But as no such continents, as we have shown, could, from the very constitution of nature, have ever existed, the mud, sand, lime, and pebbles of which the strata were constructed cannot have been drawn from such a source; and, consequently, the time which such a mode of construction would require is no criterion whatever of the period that was occupied in their formation by a different method. What a predicament for one who professes to demonstrate his theory of the vast age of the world by "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy!" Yet we appeal to him whether the supposition of such a world is not inconsistent with the constitution of nature. We appeal to him, as a chemist, whether it is not contradictory to the nature of fusion to suppose it to be produced by a creative fiat. We appeal to him, as a philosopher, whether, if the globe had existed in that state, and particles or portions of its surface had crystallized into granite or any other mineral, they would not inevitably, from their superior density, have sunk into the

depths beneath, instead of floating on the exterior. We appeal to him again, as a chemist, whether, if a granite crust had crystallized on the surface, there would not have been a total want of volcanic forces within to elevate it into mountains and continents. And finally, we appeal to him again, as a practical philosopher, whether, if there were no mountains and continents, there must not necessarily have been a total absence also of streams, lakes, and rivers. "The process of forming rocks by the accumulation of mud, sand, and gravel," in such circumstances, without either rivers to transport, or continents to yield them, would undoubtedly be "very slow." A most embarrassing dilemma truly! There is no escape from it, however, except by the total rejection of the hypothesis of a molten world on which he builds his theory, and the abandonment of the argument by which he attempts to establish the extreme age of the earth.

His fourth argument is an equal fallacy.

"Yet, in the fourth place, there must have been time enough since the creation to deposit at least ten miles of rocks in perpendicular thickness, in the manner that has been described; for the stratified rocks are at least of that thickness in Europe, and in this country much thicker; or if we regard only the fossiliferous strata as thus deposited (since some geologists might hesitate to admit that the non-fossiliferous rocks were thus produced), these are six and a half miles thick in Europe, and still thicker in this country. How immense a period was requisite for such a work! Some do, indeed, contend that the work, in all cases, as we have allowed it in a few, may have been *vastly more rapid than at the present day*; but the manner in which the materials are arranged, and especially the preservation of the most delicate parts of the organic remains, often in the very position in which the animals died, show the quiet and slow manner in which the process went on."—Pp. 53, 54.

He here proceeds again, as in his third argument, on the assumption that the strata were formed of the detritus of granite continents, that was transported to the oceans by streams that traversed those rocky masses. But as neither those streams nor continents ever existed, the materials of the strata cannot have been derived from them; and consequently their thickness is no evidence that the long period which he imagines was occupied in their construction. As the

substances of which they consist were drawn from a wholly different quarter, and transported to the places of their deposition by altogether different agents, their formation may have advanced with a thousand times the rapidity that on his hypothesis would have been practicable. He proceeds:

"In the fifth place, it is certain that, since man existed on the globe, materials for the production of rocks have not accumulated to the average thickness of more than one hundred or two hundred feet; although, in particular places, as already mentioned, the accumulations are thicker. The evidence of this position is, that neither the works nor the remains of man have been found any deeper in the earth than in the upper part of that superficial deposit called *alluvium*. But had man existed while the other deposits were going on, no possible reason can be given why his bones and the fruits of his labors should not be found mixed with those of other animals, so abundant in the rocks, to the depth of six or seven miles. In the last six thousand years, then, only one five hundredth part of the stratified rocks has been accumulated. I mention this fact, not as by any means an exact, but only an approximate measure of the time in which the older rocks were deposited; for the precise age of the world is probably a problem which science can never solve. All the means of comparison within our reach enable us to say only that its duration must have been immense."—Pp. 54, 55.

Dr. H. here proceeds on the assumption, that if man had existed during the period in which the strata were deposited, he must have resided in Europe and America, or at least on lands so immediately in their vicinity, that his relics would have been borne within their precincts, and buried in their rocks. Otherwise, the fact that his remains are not found interred in the strata of Europe and America, is no proof that he was not a resident during their deposition in some other part of the globe. He indisputably, however, did not reside in any part of Europe or America during those ages, inasmuch as these continents were then, as Dr. Hitchcock himself admits, and their strata themselves demonstrate, buried beneath the seas. If the earth which was occupied by man anterior to the deluge was situated in the scene that is now occupied by the Indian or Pacific Oceans, there is no reason to suppose that any of his relics could have ever floated to the seas that then covered the site of the present continents of Asia, Europe, or America. Can Dr. Hitchcock

persuade himself that any of the human carcasses that are now wafted in countless numbers down the Ganges and Niger ever find their way into the North Pacific or Northern Atlantic, and become imbedded in the strata which he holds are forming on the bottom of those seas? Why, then, should he any more suppose that the bodies of the antediluvians that may have been borne by rivers into seas that were still more remote, should necessarily have been transported to the oceans that then spread over Europe and North America, and found a sepulchre in the strata that were then accumulating on their bottoms? So far, then, from there being "no possible reason why his bones and the fruits of his labors should not be found mixed with those of other animals in the rocks" of Europe and America, had he "existed while the other deposits were going on," there is the most satisfactory reason for it in the fact, that the earth which he occupied was situated at a distance that precluded the transportation of his remains into the oceans beneath which the rocks of Europe and this continent were formed. The absence, accordingly, of his relics from the strata of these continents, presents no proof nor probability that he was not a resident of the earth during the period of their deposition. His next argument is equally mistaken.

"In the sixth place, during the deposition of the stratified rocks, a great number of changes must have occurred in the matter of which they are composed. Hundreds of such changes can be easily counted, and they often imply great changes in the waters holding the materials in solution or suspension; such changes indeed as must have required different oceans over the same spot. Such events could not have taken place without extensive elevations and subsidences of the earth's crust, nor could such vertical movements have happened without much intervening time, as many facts too technical to be here detailed, show. Here then we have another evidence of vast periods of time occupied in the secondary production and arrangements of the earth's crust."—P. 55.

But the time that was requisite to the accomplishment of these various changes, depended on the agents by which they were caused, and the circumstances in which they acted. There is nothing in the nature of the effects themselves that shows that they cannot have been dispatched as well in fif-

teen or eighteen centuries, as they could in fifteen or eighteen myriads. Dr. H. proceeds on the assumption that the rate at which they were advanced, was essentially that at which what he regards as similar changes are now taking place on the earth's surface. But that is a wholly unsuitable and deceptive standard of measurement; first, because no such changes are now in progress; no strata like those of either the primary, the secondary, or the tertiary groups are now in the process of formation; and next, because there were then no such rocky continents as his hypothesis contemplates, in existence, from which detritus could have been derived for the construction of the strata. He falls into the error of assuming that the rate at which the changes to which he refers, might have been wrought in *the imaginary and impossible conditions* which his hypothesis contemplates, is the rate at which they were in fact accomplished by wholly different agents in totally different circumstances. A beautiful method, truly, of demonstrating his propositions by "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy!" He adds:

"In the seventh place, numerous races of animals and plants must have occupied the globe previous to those which now inhabit it, and have successively passed away, as catastrophes occurred, or the climate became unfit for their residence. Not less than thirty thousand species have already been dug out of the rocks, and except a few hundred species, mostly of sea shells, occurring in the uppermost rocks, none of them correspond to those now living on the globe. In Europe they are found to the depth of about six and a half miles, and in this country deeper; and no living species is found more than one twelfth of this depth. All the rest are specifically and often generically unlike living species; and the conclusion seems irresistible, that they must have lived and died before the creation of the present species. Indeed, so different was the climate in those early times—it having been much warmer than at present in most parts of the world—that but few of the present races could have lived then. Still further: it appears that during the whole period since organized beings first appeared on the globe, not less than four or five, and probably more—some think as many as ten or twelve—entire races have passed away, and been succeeded by recent ones; so that the globe has actually changed all its inhabitants half a dozen times. Yet each of the successive groups occupied it long enough to leave immense quantities of their remains, which some-

times constitute almost entire mountains. And in general these groups became extinct in consequence of a change of climate, which, if imputed to any known cause, must have been an extremely slow process.

"Now these results are no longer to be regarded as the dreams of fancy, but the legitimate deductions of long and careful observation of facts. And can any reasonable man conceive how such changes can have taken place since the six days of creation, or within the last six thousand years? In order to reconcile them with such a supposition, we must admit of hypotheses and absurdities more wild and extravagant than have ever been charged upon geology. But admit of a long period between the first creative act and the six days, and all difficulties vanish."—Pp. 55, 56.

This is regarded by him and other geologists as an altogether unanswerable proof of the vast age of the world. It is, however, in our judgment,—though somewhat more plausible—as weak and valueless as any of the others which he alleges. The great multitude and diversity of the animal relics that are buried in the strata, form no obstacle whatever to the supposition that they all had their existence since the date of the Mosaic creation; as no geologist will hesitate to admit that, numerous as they are, an equal number might have existed in the ocean in even fifteen or twenty centuries. And no one assuredly will question that vast multitudes of them, and whole races, might have been destroyed at half-a-dozen or a dozen epochs, by sudden catastrophes. The effusion of deadly gases into the waters might have dispatched the population of vast tracts and whole seas in a few moments; and that, or the transfusion of vast volumes of the earthy and mineral substances of which the strata in which they are imbedded consist, appears to have been the cause of their destruction. Their relics generally indicate that they perished—not, as Dr. H. represents, by a change of climate—but by agents that accomplished their work speedily, and that, ere decay had commenced, they were buried in the soft stratum that was forming at the bottom. The destruction of the races that have perished, required, therefore, no long period. But still less can long periods have been necessary to the creation of their successors. God had but to say, as he did in the beginning:—Let the waters

bring forth *abundantly*;—and they would have been peopled again as thickly as they had previously been. Dr. H. seems to suppose, notwithstanding the scale on which they were called into being on the third day of the Mosaic epoch, that only a single pair of the new races would have been created, and that ages, therefore, must have revolved ere the waters could have become stocked with their progeny.

As then the races that perished were extinguished suddenly, and those that succeeded were as instantaneously called into being, the fact that they consist of several successive races is not only no proof that a longer period was occupied by them, than would have been requisite had they all been of the same genera or species; but indicates that it was far less; as the space necessary for their creation was but a moment, while the repopulation of the waters by propagation from a few survivors would have required a considerable time. This argument, which has been so confidently relied on to settle the question of the great age of the earth, thus turns out not only to be without validity, but to confute itself. His next argument is equally mistaken.

“In the eighth place, the denudations and erosions that have taken place on the earth's surface, indicate a far higher antiquity to the globe, even since it assumed essentially its present condition, than the common interpretation of Genesis admits. The geologist can prove that in many cases the rocks have been worn away by the slow action of the ocean, more than two miles in depth in some regions, and those very wide; as in South Wales in England. As the continents rose from the ocean, the slow drainage by the rivers has excavated numerous long and deep gorges, requiring periods incalculably extended.

“I do not wonder that when the sceptic stands upon the banks of Niagara River, and sees how obviously the splendid cataract has worn out the deep gorge extending to Lake Ontario, he should feel that there is a standing proof that the common opinions as to the age of the world *cannot be true*; and hence be led to discard the Bible, if he supposes that to be a true interpretation.

“But the Niagara gorge is only one among a multitude of examples of erosion that might be quoted; and some of them far more striking to a geologist.”—Pp. 56, 57.

In this, however, he proceeds on the assumption, un-

doubtedly, that the rocks that have undergone these vast excavations, were as hard and indisintegrable at their elevation from the ocean, as they now are. But that a practical geologist should for a moment entertain such a persuasion, is surprising; as there are the most indisputable and ample evidences that at the emergence of the mountains and continents from the deep, the rocks of every description were in a state so soft and easily disintegrable, that the whole of the vast denudations and erosions which they have suffered might have been accomplished within the period that passed before their hardening was completed. The excavation of the gorge at Niagara, therefore, instead of requiring a vast round of ages, was not improbably dispatched in the main, as was shown in our last number, in a few months or days.

This fact sets aside his next argument also.

"Ninthly. Since the geological period now passing commenced, called the *alluvial*, or pleistocene period, certain changes have been going on, which indicate a very great antiquity to the drift period, which was the commencement of the alluvial period, and has been considered among the most recent of geological events. I refer to the formation of deltas and terraces.

"Terraces occur along some of the rivers of our country from four hundred to five hundred feet above their present beds, and around our lakes to the height of near one thousand feet. They are composed of gravel, sand, clay, and loam, that have been comminuted, and sorted, and deposited by water chiefly. At a height two or three times greater, on the same rivers and lakes, we find what seem to be ancient sea beaches, of the same materials deposited earlier and less comminuted. The same facts occur also in Europe and probably in Asia.

"Now, it seems quite certain that these beaches and terraces were formed as the continents were being drained of the waters of the ocean, and the rivers were cutting down their beds; which last process has been going on in many places to the present day. Yet, scarcely nowhere, since the memory of man, have even the lowest of these terraces and beaches been formed, save on a very limited scale, and of a few feet in height. The lowest of them have been the sites of towns and cities, ever since the settlement of our country, and on the eastern continent much longer. Yet we see the processes by which they have been formed now in operation; but they have scarcely made

any progress during the period of human history. How vast the period, then, since the work was first commenced! Yet, even its commencement seems to have been no further back than the drift epoch, since that deposit lies beneath the terraces. But the drift period was comparatively a very recent one in the geological scale. How do such facts impress us with the vast duration of the globe since the first series of changes commenced!"—Pp. 57–60.

But he here proceeds, as before, on the assumption that when the excavations took place by which these terraces and beaches were formed, the rocky masses through which the gorges are cut, were as hard and unyielding as they now are; but this is confuted by the rocks themselves. The innumerable bends, contortions, and foldings that are seen in the whole series of the strata, from the lowest of the unfossiliferous up to the latest of the tertiary that lie on the crests and slopes of the mountains, present the most incontestable proofs that they were at their elevation in so soft and pliant a state, as to have rendered their wear and excavation, on as vast a scale as has taken place, inevitable by the resistless surges and currents of the ocean, which the elevation of the continents must have occasioned. Their rapid emergence from an ocean, two, three, or four miles in depth, accomplished by two or three upheavals with short intervals between, would be sufficient to account for the deepest and most extensive denudations and gorges which the strata exhibit; but two or three alternate subsidences and elevations, which geologists generally admit must, at least, in some regions, have taken place, are amply sufficient for their explanation. As that then was the state of the rocks when their erosion took place, and the powerful waves and currents of the retreating ocean were the agents by which it was wrought, the supposition that vast periods were occupied in its accomplishment, is wholly untenable. Their denudations and channellings would have been immeasurably greater, had not the time during which the waters wrought at them, been limited to a few days, instead of stretching through innumerable years.

He founds his last argument for the great age of the earth on the hypothesis that it existed in its first form, in a state of vapor, and that it passed through changes, therefore, ante-

cedently to the formation of the stratified rocks, "that required vast periods of time;" but that, we have already shown, is not only a mere supposition, but is inconsistent with the laws of matter.

Such, then, is his vaunted theoretical geology, which he ranks among the demonstrative sciences; and such are the arguments, drawn partly from his theory, and partly from the facts of the strata, which he employs to verify it. His inference of the age of the earth is founded, without any disguise, on an hypothesis of events, of causes, and of conditions, that lie altogether out of the domain of practical geology, and are not merely incapable of proof, but are demonstrably impossible, from their contradiction to the constitution of nature. Gravity, mechanics, chemistry, electricity, the laws, in short, of every agent and force that is concerned in the production of geological effects on the earth's surface, are disregarded and contravened by it. And yet this fantastic dream, without a shadow of evidence to sustain it, unphilosophical in every respect, and presenting the boldest contradictions to the most fundamental truths of those branches of knowledge with which his profession should have rendered him—and undoubtedly has—most familiar, he dignifies with the lofty name of a science, verified by "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy," and scarcely inferior to any other in the certainty of its demonstrations! In his few arguments drawn from the nature and condition of the strata, also, he exhibits an equal disregard of their great facts, and of the agents by which they were produced. Was there ever a more unfortunate exhibition of a total misjudgment of a subject? Can any more unanswerable demonstration be needed, that his theoretical geology is not in any sense a science; and that his arguments in favor of his theory of the antiquity of the earth, from the practical branch of the subject, are not sustained by the strata, but are at war with them, and with the powers and conditions of the agents by which they were produced? Yet he winds up this singular medley of unscientific and false reasoning with the following conclusion:

"Now, let this imperfect summary of evidence in favor of the earth's high antiquity be candidly weighed, and can any one think it strange, that every man who has carefully and extensively examined

the rocks in their native beds, is entirely convinced of its validity! Men of all professions, and of diverse opinions concerning the Bible, have been geologists; but on this point they are unanimous, however they may differ as to other points in the science. Must we not, then, regard this fact as one of the settled principles of the science? If so, who will hesitate to say that it ought to settle the interpretation of the first of Genesis, in favor of the meaning which allows an intervening period between the creation of matter and the creation of light? This is the grand point which I have aimed to establish."—P. 60, 61.

What a beautiful method at a stroke of determining an important fact, establishing a scientific principle, and enacting a law of interpretation! He first adopts an hypothesis that the world originally existed in a state of which he has no proof, and that is inconsistent with the laws of matter. He next builds a theory of the formation of the strata out of the materials of that hypothetical world, which is also altogether incompatible with the constitution of nature, and denominates the period which he deems the process would have occupied *a fact*. That supposititious fact he proceeds to erect into a *settled principle of the science*; and then forthwith converts that principle into a *law of interpretation*. And finally, having wrought that metamorphosis, he employs that law—not to determine the meaning of the language of the first verse of Genesis, which is the proper office of a law of interpretation—but to justify THE INTERPOLATION of an *immeasurable period* betwixt the event announced in that verse and that which is recorded in the verse that follows! and all this in the lofty and authoritative names of *science and religion*! Was such a tissue of monstrosities ever before presented to the faith of men? Did misconception and mistake ever before reign on such a scale? If the conclusion at which he has arrived, by a process of false logic, from a false and unphilosophical hypothesis, were admitted to be a fact, how could that fact become a scientific principle, by which its own existence is to be explained? And if that extraordinary transformation could be accomplished, how could that scientific principle then be converted into a rule of interpretation, the office of which should be, not to determine the meaning of the language of the first chapter of Genesis, but to prove that a period of immeasurable length intervened between the

creative act that is recorded in the first verse, and that which is narrated in the second? What an extraordinary confusion of ideas in a scientific investigation, conducted according to "the strictest rules of the Baconian philosophy!"

Having thus, as he supposes, established the great antiquity of the earth, he proceeds:

"This interpretation of Genesis is entirely sufficient to remove all apparent collision between geology and revelation. It gives the geologist full scope for his largest speculations concerning the age of the world. It permits him to maintain that its first condition was as unlike to the present as possible, and allows him time enough for all the changes of mineral constitution and organic life which its strata reveal. It supposes that all these are passed over in silence by the sacred writers, because irrelevant to the object of revelation, but full of interest and instruction to the men of science who should afterwards take pleasure in exploring the works of God.

"It supposes the six days' work of creation to have been confined entirely to the fitting up the world in its present condition, and furnishing it with its present inhabitants. Thus, while it gives the widest scope to the geologist, it does not encroach on the literalness of the Bible; and hence it is not strange that it should be almost universally adopted by geologists, as well as by many eminent divines."—P. 61.

To this we answer, in the first place, that the treatment which he advocates of the first verses of Genesis is not an *interpretation*, but a mere *interpolation* of a vast period between the events that are narrated in them, for which he presents no authority whatever. It is an extraordinary misrepresentation to denominate such an arbitrary violation of the passage an interpretation, and exhibit it as sanctioned by a "settled principle" of hermeneutics.

In the next place, he takes for granted the point on which he proceeds in his interpretation, that the heavens and earth of the first verse, which God created in the beginning, comprehend the whole material universe. But that is not merely groundless; it is inconsistent with the meaning of the terms. The word heaven is used in the chapter to denote the atmosphere, and the sun, moon, and other orbs that are stationed in the regions above, that are perceptible by the unassisted eye. Thus God is said in six days to have made

the heavens and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,—which includes the sun, moon, and stars which appear to us to be stationed in the vault of heaven; and he is accordingly said to have set the sun, moon, and stars *in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth*, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness (v. 16—18); where heaven is used to denote the region above, where they appear to be stationed. And that, and the worlds that are seen there, are all that it includes; as there are no orbs that give light upon the earth, and fill the office of rulers of the day and night, except those of our solar system, and the stars that are visible to the naked eye; and the latter all belong to the nebula or cloud of worlds, of which our system is a part. The suns of other similar clusters are discernible only by the telescope, and take no part either in the determination of our seasons and years, or in the illumination of our atmosphere. The heavens and earth, the creation of which is recorded in the passage, denote, therefore, nothing more, besides the atmosphere, than the system of worlds to which our solar train, and the stars and constellations of our sky, belong; and that was indubitably the sense in which the Hebrews were accustomed to employ them. That there were other worlds in existence at that epoch that were not included under the term, is indicated in the Bible, in the representation that when “the foundations of the earth” were laid, “the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy;” and in the fact, that Satan and his angels, who had held a principality, had then already fallen.

In the third place, the sense which he assigns to the second verse, in order to adjust it to his assumption that the earth had, at the epoch to which that relates, existed through a vast period, been inhabited by the animal races that are entombed in the strata, and at length reduced to a waste and submerged beneath the ocean, is a sheer fabrication, and the direct converse of its true meaning. By the laws of grammar, the earth of the second verse, which is declared to have been unfurnished and waste—that is, without vegetables, or animals, or any preparation for them—was identically the earth of the first verse; and the state of unoccupiedness and waste in which it then existed, was that in which it was in the beginning created. This is unquestionably the philolo-

gical meaning of the passage. The sense, however, which Dr. Hitchcock ascribes to it is of a wholly different nature; for he treats it as though the announcement were,—And the earth, after having been the theatre of vegetable and animal life through innumerable ages, was at length divested of its living tenants, and converted into a waste;—propositions that assert the occurrence of events that are not mentioned nor implied in the text. That which the sacred writer affirms is, that the earth, as created, was unfurnished and waste, and that darkness rested on the face of the deep; but that which Dr. Hitchcock's construction affirms is, that it *became* unfurnished and waste, by the destruction of races of animals and vegetables that had occupied it, and the submerging of all its dry lands beneath the ocean. No two propositions can be more wholly unlike. Dr. Hitchcock, accordingly, in imputing such a meaning to the language, instead of interpreting, perverts and violates it.

But in the fourth place, the assumption that the earth was reduced from a habitable condition to such a state of ruin, is as inconsistent with the laws of nature as it is with the meaning of the passage. The principles by which physical questions are determined, forbid the assumption of any event as a fact, that cannot be proved to have taken place; or the supposition of any event as an occurrence, that is not at least consistent with the laws of matter. But Dr. H. here assumes the occurrence of a combination of the most stupendous catastrophes, of which he has no evidences whatever, and of which he can give no explanation by the forces that work the changes that are taking place in the material universe. In assuming that the earth was reduced from a habitable condition to the waste in which it existed at the epoch of the creation of light, he assumes that it had before been enveloped by an atmosphere, that it had been illuminated by the sun, that a portion of it had been elevated into dry land, and that it had been in all respects essentially such a world as it is now. At the beginning, however, of the first day of the creation, it was altogether without light, without an atmosphere, and without dry land. He assumes, therefore, that its atmosphere had been annihilated; that the sun, and all the other light-giving orbs, by which it had been lighted, had been annihilated, or at least deprived of their

power of illuminating it; and that its continents and mountains had subsided and sunk beneath the sea. But of the reality of these extraordinary catastrophes, he has not a particle of evidence; nor are there any forces now acting on the globe, by which they could have been produced. Dr. H. is a chemist. Is he aware of any forces now in activity on the earth's surface that are capable of absorbing the whole either of the oxygen or the nitrogen of which the air is constituted, and leaving the world surrounded with nothing but empty space? Is he cognizant of any forces here or elsewhere, that are capable of divesting the sun and the stars of their light-giving robes, or preventing them from transmitting their rays to the earth? Is he acquainted with any agents now in activity, that are competent to sink the whole of the continents beneath the sea, and reduce the surface of the globe to a geological level? He certainly is not. In assuming, therefore, that these catastrophes actually took place, he assumes occurrences as geological facts, which he not only cannot prove to have happened, but which lie wholly out of the sphere of geology, and are inconsistent with the powers themselves that now act on the earth. His theory, thus, instead of being in harmony with the history of the creation in Genesis, presents the grossest contradiction, both to that and to the laws of matter.

But in the fifth place, his theory is as completely at war with all the great facts of geology, as it is with the inspired record.

As there are no evidences that the waste that is predicated of the earth on the first day of the creation recorded in Genesis, was produced by a submersion of land that had been dry, an annihilation of an atmosphere, an extinction or interception of light, and a destruction of animal and vegetable races; and as the supposition that such catastrophes took place is inconsistent with the powers of nature, the fact that the earth was enveloped with an atmosphere, and illuminated by the sun, and that portions of its surface were dry during the formation of the strata in which animals and vegetables are imbedded, must be taken as a demonstration that those animals and vegetables existed, and thence that the strata in which they are entombed were deposited since the creation recorded by Moses. These geological

monuments, therefore, instead of supporting Dr. H.'s theory of the measureless age of the earth, are direct and unanswerable proofs of its total error.

Moreover, it is certain from the fact that the globe was enveloped by the ocean till the third day of the creation, when dry land was made to appear, that all the principal mountains and continents of the earth were elevated after that epoch, not to say subsequently to the deluge. From the fact that the great mountain ranges have, on their crests and sides, vast masses of the tertiary strata, it is also certain that their elevation from the ocean took place after the formation of those strata. But it is equally certain that all the vast denudations and excavations which those mountain ranges and the strata that rest on their summits, slopes, and feet have undergone, took place at the period of their upheaval from the ocean, and subsequently. This is held even by Dr. Hitchcock. It was "as the continents rose from the ocean," he represents, that rocky masses were swept away in many places to the depth of miles, and "rivers excavated" their long and deep gorges," p. 56. These geological facts, therefore, show that those erosions and excavations cannot have occupied the vast round of ages which he supposes, but were wrought subsequently at most to the third day of the creation; and as they were finished thousands of years ago, can have occupied but a very brief period. They confute the argument accordingly which he founds on them, for the great antiquity of the world, and overturn his theory.

Such is the issue of his attempt to reconcile his theory with the narrative in Genesis. Instead of having, as he claims, the sanction of a scientific principle, the facts of geology, or the language of the sacred writer, it is in the most violent antagonism to them all. A more unphilosophical and absurd device was never contrived for the purpose of escaping an embarrassing objection. Dr. H. appears to have adopted it without even looking at its bearing, either on the text or on his theory. The Bible declares not only that in the "beginning God created the heaven and the earth," but that he "made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, in six days;" and that the narration of their creation in Genesis is a true account of the origin of the heavens and of the earth, "when they were created in the day that the

Lord God made the earth and the heavens."—Gen. ii. 1-4. "Geology" teaches, Dr. H. avers, that it was not so, but that the heavens and earth had existed through an immeasurable period prior to that epoch. Can a more preposterous fancy be entertained, than that these two opposite representations are reconciled by the hypothesis, that there is an *omission* in the sacred narrative of the fact, that the heavens and earth were created innumerable ages anterior to the date of the six days? That hypothesis does not alter their relation to each other. So far from it, it contemplates them as direct opposites, and admits, therefore, the reality of the difficulty which it proposes to remove; and, accordingly, if a statement had been introduced between the first and second verses of Genesis i., of what that hypothesis assumes to be the fact, it would not erase or alter in any way the directly contradictory statements in Genesis ii. 1-4, and Exodus xx. 11, and xxxi. 17, that the heavens and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, were created during the six days. They would continue to declare what they now do; and the only effect of the alteration would be, to bring Gen. i., which is now in harmony with these passages, into collision with them, and transfer the responsibility of the contradiction from geology to the Bible! What a beautiful expedient of saving the theory from the discredit of impeaching the truth of the divine word! What an adroit contrivance for saving that word from the discredit of a contradiction to the facts and demonstrations of science! The hypothesis is, that one out of four or five passages in which the representation is made, that the heavens and earth were created in six days, is *totally false by an omission*; and that the interpolation of that omission brings it into harmony with the geological theory, though it makes it a blank contradiction to the other passages with which it before was coincident; or what is much the same, that if one out of several passages which declare that the heavens and the earth were created in the six days, is so altered as to refer their creation to an immeasurably earlier epoch, the geological theory is thereby invested with the sanction of revelation, although it is at the expense of making revelation contradict itself! This is the splendid device which Dr. H. dignifies with the name of a scientific principle of interpretation! Was there ever a more

extraordinary delusion? Was ever a more bold and lawless violation of the word of God proposed for the purpose of justifying an unscriptural theory? It is astounding that Dr. Hitchcock and other writers who have advanced it, should not have perceived that such is its character.

Having thus seen that his theory of the great age of the earth is at war alike with the facts of geology, the laws of nature, and the testimony of the Scriptures respecting the date of the creation, and is a sheer and monstrous dream, discountenanced alike by science and religion; we shall now show that he is altogether mistaken also in the lofty commendation which he bestows on his theory, as an auxiliary of natural and revealed religion. He indulges in the most extravagant eulogies of it in that respect. He says:

"Having once admitted the conclusions of geology as to the great age of the world, and a flood of light is shed upon some of the most difficult points both of natural and revealed religion. It shows the occurrence of numerous changes on the globe, which nothing but the power of God could have produced, and which, in fact, were most striking and stupendous miracles. Hence the arguments which have so long been employed to show that the world is eternal, are rendered nugatory; for if we can point to epochs when entire races of animals and plants began to exist on the globe, we prove the agency of a Deity quite as strikingly as if we could show the moment when the matter of the world was summoned into existence out of nothing. In the same manner, also, we silence the argument against giving a revelation from heaven, as well as the miracles by which it is substantiated, on the ground that we have no example of a special interference with the established course of nature. Here we have interpositions long anterior to man's existence, as well as by his creation, which take away all improbabilities from those which are implied in a revelation. We hence likewise establish the doctrine of a special providence over the world—a doctrine proved with great difficulty by any other reasoning of natural theology."—P. 481, 482.

He here represents that the adaptation of the facts of geology to subserve these ends, depends entirely on the theory of "the great age of the world." But that is altogether mistaken. The rocks of the earth themselves, all the vegetable and animal relics that are entombed in them, and all the proofs that they present of the direct interposition, the spe-

cial providence, and the power of God, are precisely what they are, independently of the consideration whether their existence has been comprised within six thousand years or not. The supposition that they have had a longer being does not alter their nature, or convert them into evidences or exemplifications of a new set of truths. Not a ray of light is, on that hypothesis, cast on either natural or revealed religion, that is not flashed on them with equal brilliance on the supposition that the period of the earth's existence is but six thousand years. He goes on:

"Still more abundant is the evidence derived from geology of the divine benevolence, and this evidence comes mostly from the operations and final effect of the most desolating agencies, heretofore regarded as a proof of malevolence, or at least of vindictive justice; and we may reasonably infer, that could we look through the whole system of divine government, we should find that all evil is only a necessary means of the greatest good."—P. 482.

But this does not depend at all on his theory of the age of the earth. All the proofs which geology presents of the divine benevolence exist as absolutely and have as high a significance, though the earth has subsisted but six thousand years, as they would if it were supposed to have existed through any longer period. Was there ever a more extraordinary fancy put forth, than that their nature and meaning result from their being of an immeasurably greater age?

"No one can examine existing nature, without being convinced that all its parts and operations belong to one great system. Geology makes other economies of wide extent to pass before us, opening a vista indefinitely backward into the hoary past; and it is gratifying to witness that same unity of design pervading all preceding periods of the world's history, linking the whole into one mighty scheme, worthy of its infinite contriver."—P. 482.

This, again, does not depend at all on the earth's having a greater age than six thousand years. The system is surely as absolutely one, if that is its whole age, as it can be if it has existed through an immeasurably longer period; and as many economies pass before us on the one supposition as on the other—that is, the whole series of races, from those that

were first buried in the strata, up through all the successive tribes, to those that are now living; as they comprise all of whose existence we have any evidence.

"How much also does this science enlarge our conceptions of the plans and operations of Jehovah! We had been accustomed to limit our views of the creative agency of God to a few thousand years of man's existence, and to anticipate the destruction of the material universe in a few thousand years more. But geology makes the period of man's existence on the globe only a short link of a chain of revolutions which preceded his existence, and which reaches forward immeasurably far into the future. We see the same matter in the hands of infinite wisdom, and by the means of the great conservative principle of chemical change, passing through a multitude of stupendous revolutions, sustaining countless and varied forms of organic life, and presenting an almost illimitable panorama of the plans of an infinite God."—Pp. 482, 483.

Astonishing illusions truly! Extravagances of misconception that indicate that Dr. H. has embarked on an ocean where he has no sun or stars to direct his course, and is voyaging without compass or rudder! "Geology" prevents us from anticipating "the destruction of the material universe in a few thousand years more!" If,—as for aught we know it may be,—it is the reason that he does not indulge that anticipation, we cannot envy him the credit it reflects on his knowledge either of hermeneutics or geology. There is not a hint in the Scriptures that *the material universe* is to be annihilated; nor if any of their language were supposed to foreshow such a catastrophe, could geology furnish any proofs that it is not to take place? How can that science, which relates exclusively to this world, show that the fabric of the universe, the continued existence of which depends, not on the constitution or laws of matter, but on the Creator's upholding agency, is or is not to be hereafter struck by his will from being? Or how can his *theory* of the age of the world enlarge "our views of the creative agency of God?" That theory does not imply that he has created anything *more* in this world than is ascribed to him by the other. It only exhibits him as having extended the work over a longer period. The number of plants and animals to which he has given existence is, on either supposition, the same. And

what information does geology give us respecting the epoch at which other parts of the universe that have no connexion with ours, were called into existence? What does it teach us respecting the length of the period during which the morning stars which sang together and the sons of God who shouted for joy, have existed? Or what light does it throw on "the immeasurable future?" What indication does the fact that the earthy, mineral, and gaseous elements of our globe are not annihilated by chemical processes, furnish either that our world is or is not hereafter to be struck from existence by the fiat of the Almighty? In what a labyrinth of misconceptions and illusions has Dr. H. lost himself! Yet he winds up this tissue of fallacies with the following extraordinary rhapsody:—

"If such is the fruit which geology pours into the lap of religion, how misunderstood have been its principles! In many a mind there is still an anxious fear lest its discoveries should prove unfavorable to religion; and they would feel greatly relieved could they only be assured that no influence injurious to piety would emanate from that science. But we can give them far more than this assurance. We can draw from this science more to illustrate and confirm religion than from any other."—P. 483.

He thus, to the last, confounds his theory of the age and primary condition of the earth, with the facts of geology; and arrogates to it the credit of the truths that are taught only by the latter; while he represents the facts of geology as exciting the apprehension and doubts of which his theory alone is the occasion. It is his anti-scriptural hypotheses and speculations that are regarded as unfriendly to religion; not the facts which are brought to light by the investigations of the strata.

He falls into still worse errors in his attempt to show that geology furnishes any presumptive indications of the non-eternity of matter, or any effective proofs of the divine existence or agency; as in the admissions and assumptions on which he proceeds, he yields to the pantheist and atheist the points for which they contend. He proposes "to examine the arguments that have been adduced to prove the non-eternity of the world, independently of geology and revelation; and to derive from these two sources of evidence

the true ground on which that proposition rests ;" and after stating those arguments and presenting objections to them, pronounces them unsatisfactory.

"Such is a fair summary, as I believe, of the arguments usually adduced, aside from the Bible and geology, to prove the non-eternity of the world. I am not prepared to say that they amount to nothing, but I do believe they perplex, rather than convince, and that some of them are mere metaphysical quibbles. They do not produce that instantaneous conviction which most of the arguments of natural theology force upon the mind ; and it is easy to see how a man of a sceptical turn should rise from their examination entirely unaffected, or affected unfavorably. Let us now, therefore, turn to geology, and inquire whether its archives will afford us any clearer light upon the subject."—P. 161.

And he admits that it does not.

"And here we must confess, at the outset, that geology furnishes us no more evidence than the other sciences of the creation of the matter of the universe out of nothing."—P. 161.

And he adds on a later page.

"Is natural theology, in fact, destitute of all satisfactory proof that the matter of the universe had a beginning ? *Such proof*, it seems to me, *she will seek in vain in the wide fields of physical and mathematical science* ; and the solution of the question which metaphysics offers, we have seen, does not satisfy."—P. 173.

He claims, however, that geology furnishes evidence of the existence and agency of the Deity.

"But it furnishes us with examples of such modifications of matter as could be effected only by a Deity. Suppose, then, we should be obliged to acknowledge to the atheist that we yield to him the point of matter's eternal existence, if he pleases, because we can find nowhere in nature decisive evidence of its creation, and then take our stand upon the arrangements and metamorphoses of matter. Or rather suppose we say to him that we shall not contend with him as to the origin of matter, but challenge him to explain, if he can, without a Deity, its modifications, as taught by geology. If that science does disclose to us such changes on the globe as no power and wisdom but those of an infinite God could produce, then of

what consequence is it, so far as religion is concerned, whether we can or cannot demonstrate the first creation of matter? I can conceive of no religious truth that would be unfavorably affected, though we should admit that this point cannot be settled. Let us, then, at least for the sake of argument, admit that it cannot be, and proceed to inquire whether, aside from this point, geology does not teach us all that is necessary to establish the most perfect system of Theism."—P. 162.

But, in admitting matter to be self-existent, he, in effect, admits that it must itself be the cause of all its conditions and modifications, and thence cuts off the possibility of proving, from the organization portions of it assume, that there is a distinct, independent, and creating Deity. The supposition that matter is self-existent, or that the cause of its existence lies in itself, is a supposition that the cause lies in itself entirely that it is what it is; that is, that it is of such a nature as it is, and has such a constitution; and that is, that it exists in such a mode, or, in other words, that its particles are such as they are, have such powers and susceptibilities, exist in such relations to each other, and exert and are the subjects of such influences; and thence that it has such forms, and passes through such operations. But that includes all that is predicable of it—nature, constitution, arrangement of parts, form, hardness, density, weight, color, temperature, processes, and all other properties and conditions that can be affirmed of it. It accordingly involves the supposition that it is itself the cause of all the organized forms into which portions of it are wrought; and thence that it is itself the author of all the displays of intelligence, wisdom, benignity, and power, which those organizations present, and is therefore a self-existent intelligence. But that is material pantheism, and the only theism that is on that hypothesis credible; for if matter is such an intelligence, and the author of all the manifestations of wisdom and power which the material world presents, it cannot be proved that there is any other intelligence.

On the other hand, the supposition that matter owes the organizations which it assumes, and the forms in which it exists, to the act of Jehovah, excludes the supposition that it is self-existent; inasmuch as, if it is self-existent, the reason

that it has such a particular internal constitution and arrangement of parts as it has, and exists in such forms—that is, that portions of it are organized—must lie altogether within itself, and not in an external cause. To suppose that while it is self-existent, or the cause of its being lies in itself, it is owing to a foreign cause that it exists with *the arrangement of parts, and in the forms* in which it does, and has the powers and susceptibilities that it has, is a sheer contradiction; for it implies that the cause of its existence, which must undoubtedly be the cause of its nature, is wholly different from the cause of the forces and laws that determine the mode in which it exists, and the processes that take place in it. But no greater solecism can be imagined than to suppose, that while one thing is the sole cause of its existence, a wholly different one is the cause of everything besides that that belongs to it—constitution, arrangement of parts, powers and susceptibilities in respect to itself and other objects, organization, and forms. To suppose that these are not the product of the same cause as its existence, is not only to suppose that the cause of its existence, and the cause of its nature, or properties and powers, are wholly different, but that it may exist without having any form, properties, or nature. If Jehovah, then, is the creator of plants and animals, or the author of any of the modifications which matter assumes, matter cannot be self-existent. His being its absolute creator and upholder, is an indispensable condition of his determining the modes and forms in which it exists, or exerting any influence on it. In admitting, therefore, that matter is uncreated and self-existent, Dr. Hitchcock, in effect, admits that it is the cause of all the organisms that are formed of it, and cuts himself off from the possibility of proving that Jehovah is the creator of plants and animals.

He involves himself in a similar self-contradiction in his endeavor to make out that geology presents more effective proofs of God's existence and agency in the affairs of the world than we gain from any other quarter, from the fact that it reveals to us organized bodies that appear not to have descended from predecessors, and that must have owed their existence, therefore, to the direct interposition of a creator; for he proceeds in this attempt on the tacit assumption, that it is not the existence and the nature of such beings that

form decisive proofs that they were created by the Almighty, but only the fact, that they were not generated by other beings of their own order. He says:

"It has been argued with much apparent plausibility by Dr. Paley, that whenever we find a complicated organic structure, adapted to produce beneficial results, its origin must be sought beyond itself; and since the world abounds with such organisms, it cannot be eternal; that is, the mere existence of animals and plants proves their non-eternity.

"Now, without asserting that there is no force in this argument, I have two remarks to make upon it. The first is to quote the reply to it which such a writer as David Hume has given. . . . 'For aught we can know *à priori*, matter may contain the source or spring of order originally within itself as well as mind does; and there is no more difficulty in conceiving that the several elements, from an internal unknown cause, may fall into the most exquisite arrangement, than to conceive that their ideas in the great universal mind, from a like internal unknown cause, fall into their arrangement. To say that the different ideas which compose the reason of the Supreme fall into order of themselves, and by their own nature, is really to talk without any precise meaning. If it has a meaning, I would fain know why it is not as good sense to say, that the parts of the material world fall into order of themselves, and by their own nature. Can the one opinion be intelligible while the other is not so?'—P. 152.

Here, Mr. Hume in fact assumes that we may, with reason, suppose that matter is as intelligent and conscious as mind is. For we are not unaware of the cause that our ideas take the order which they do; that is, that we reason from cause to effect, and from effect to cause; and that in an argument, we place the premise first, the proof next, and the conclusion last. We are conscious that the reason of it lies in the nature and relation of the ideas which they severally express: and accordingly, if an argument is addressed to us that is not conclusive, we are conscious that it is because these parts have not the peculiar qualities that fit them for their place; or are not arranged in their proper order; as that the point to be proved is assumed in the premise; that the proof is irrelevant; or that the conclusion is a fallacy. According to Mr. Hume's representation we ought to be as conscious of the reason that the particles that form our bones,

muscles, and flesh, are arranged in the order they are, as we are of the reason that our thoughts stand in the relations to each other which they do, when they form what we feel to be a conclusive argument.

This piece of transparent Spinozism, Dr. H., however, **thinks** it impossible to refute, except by instances of the **creation** of organized beings, independently of the instrumentality of second causes. Thus he says:

"Fairly to meet this reasoning of the prince of sceptics is not an achievement of dulness or ignorance. In order to do it triumphantly, we want what Dr. Paley could not find, a distinct example of the creation of numerous organic beings by some cause independent of themselves."—P. 152.

Now, to say nothing of the consideration that the **existence** of such organized beings would not be regarded by a disciple of Hume as a confutation of his theory: that **instead**, they would naturally be alleged as proofs of its truth; inasmuch as they are instances of organization of which, on his system, no cause can be seen, except the **matter** of which they consist; to say nothing of this, Dr. Hitchcock proceeds in his argument on the assumption, that the reason that such organized beings present a proof of the **existence** and agency of a supreme intelligence and creator, **lies**—not in the *nature* of those beings themselves, but in the mere fact that no others of the same kind are known to have existed, from which they can have descended; for if the proofs which they present of the existence and agency of a creator, lie altogether in their *nature*; that is, in the fact that they are in arrangement of parts, adaptations, powers, and their whole constitution, what they are, then they form as direct and unanswerable a proof of a creator, although they descended from others of their kind, as though they did not. As their nature in each case is identically the same: that which their nature *proves*, must be identically the same. In assuming, then, as Dr. Hitchcock does, that it is not by their nature that they show that they are the work of an intelligent creator, he admits that they present no *proof* whatever of a creator; for if no such proof is furnished by their nature, as that is all that belongs to them, they plainly furnish no such proof at all.

The confutation of Mr. Hume's sophistry, and demonstration of the divine existence by more effective proofs than are furnished by any other department of knowledge, which Dr. Hitchcock and others have so confidently and boastfully claimed for geology, thus turns out to be nothing less than a complete surrender of the truth, and adoption and sanction of positions that lead directly to the pantheism and atheism which he flatters himself he has overthrown.

He runs into errors and extravagances also, of an extraordinary character, in his speculations in regard to the future life, and several other themes; but they are not so closely connected with his main subject, as to make it essential that we should point them out.

It is apparent, then, from these considerations that Dr. Hitchcock's speculative geology has no title whatever to the character he arrogates for it, of a demonstrative science: nor his theory of the great age of the world any claim to be regarded as an established fact. So far from it, they are wild fantastic fancies that not only have no foundation whatever in the strata, but are in total antagonism alike to the facts of geology and to the laws of matter. Nor are they entitled in any manner to the praise he so zealously lavishes on them, of harmony with the Scriptures, and an effective corroboration of the doctrines of natural religion. Instead, no doctrines in the whole circle of false speculation afford a more direct and fatal contradiction to the teachings of revelation, or are more natural and powerful auxiliaries of scepticism and infidelity.

To those who concur in this judgment, it cannot be necessary to dwell on the duty of openly rejecting these errors, and endeavoring to arrest the mischievous influences they are exerting. What louder call was ever addressed to good men to exert themselves to intercept the spread of a great evil? It is demanded by the interests of learning. The wildest dreams of the alchemists of the dark ages, are not more unworthy of the learned of the present time, than the belief and support of this system, which sets at such open defiance the plainest facts and laws of every branch of physical knowledge with which it has any connexion; and substitutes the fictions of false conjecture and hypothesis in their place. The credit of their profession requires that the

cultivators and teachers of geology should discard it, and enter on a re-investigation, and re-construction of the science. It is demanded also by the interests of religion. The credit of its ministers requires that they should vindicate the word of God from the imputation which the theory casts on it, and protect their people from the fatal prepossessions and errors into which it is adapted to betray them. May God give them fidelity and wisdom to fulfil this great duty!

ART. II.—THE NEGLECT OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

BY THE REV. R. W. DICKINSON, D.D.

How widely dissimilar from the spirit of either imposture or of despotism is the genius of Christianity! While the one shrinks from scrutinizing inquiry—conscious of safety only in evasion and subterfuge—and the other opposes the advancement of knowledge as inimical to its sinister designs; the latter loves to appear in her own native element of light. Her step is firm, her attitude erect; and as she looks upwards with an unflinching eye, we may discover in her every feature the reflected lineaments of heaven. Conscious of being “the way, the truth, and the life,” her very aspect bespeaks an openness and a sincerity which serve to invite our approach and win our confidence.

No intelligent reader of the evangelical narratives needs to be told that the course which Jesus Christ pursued was eminently fitted not only to satisfy the inquiring, but to convince the doubting, and silence gainsayers. It was not enough for him to speak as never man spoke; he must act as never man acted, and do what never man did. If diseases fled before his presence; if the waves of the sea were awed into silence by his voice; if the dead came forth from their graves at his summons, well did it become him to say, “If ye believe not me, believe me for my very works’ sake.”

Aware, however, that his miracles were more adapted to the conviction of the Gentiles, he referred the Jews to the oracles of the living God—that book which had been attested by a long series of judgments and of deliverances; to

which their existence as a separate people bore unequivocal witness; which was enthroned in the national faith, and sacred to every Jewish feeling. Conscious of being "the light of the world," he had more to apprehend from men's closing than opening their eyes; incomparably more from bigotry and ignorance than from the most piercing scrutiny of candid intelligence. Hence, it appears, that his enemies among the Jews were either infidel in relation to their own Scriptures, or bigoted formalists and pharisaical hypocrites; that the rejection of his gospel by many of the heathen philosophers was owing to their contempt which precluded all examination of its claims; and that ever since, not a solitary instance of scepticism can be traced to a dispassionate and careful estimate of the Scriptural evidences. And hence it is, also, that Christianity, being a system of truth, founded in immutable relations, and supported by evidence, has survived the roughest usage, the acutest criticism, as well as the most malicious scrutiny; that it has dissipated the mists of superstition, and shaken the throne of ignorance; and that, by liberating and energizing the general mind, it constitutes the grand incitement to all discoveries and improvements.

In keeping with its high character, are its strong and urgent recommendations of investigation and knowledge; and in this respect, it is prominently distinguished from all the systems of man's device. Certain it is, that Christ did not wish his followers to be ignorant of God's revelation; and why has his will been revealed but to be understood? or of what avail the Scriptures unless diligently studied? It is not our object, however, to assign any reasons for their study, but simply to inquire, why they are still so much neglected?

If a manuscript had been discovered amid the ruins of *Herculaneum*, or beneath the mouldering dust of ancient *Thebes*, with what impatience would we await its publication; how eager would be our curiosity to ascertain its purport! There is a fondness in the human mind to explore the past—to traverse antiquity, conjecturing, not erroneously, that its inquiries will be relieved by interesting views, and its labor compensated by lessons of wisdom. Might it not be expected then, that the Bible, taking triumphant precedence of all other books, would seize upon the general mind, and hold it in intensest study, until its every page had been unfolded,

and every fact, incident, and truth intelligently mastered. What greater object of curiosity could there have been to the philosophers of old, than a book announcing itself to be the most ancient in the world; written in the earliest language, recording the birth of creation, the origin of man, the history of infant time; resolving the mystery of our being, the causes of those melancholy phenomena which designate both our nature and our globe, and leading the mind onward, speaks of the remotest future with all the unaffected simplicity and rational consistency with which it delineates the past; foretells not only the revolutions of empires and the downfall of kingdoms, but the end of the world; while it discloses to thought scenes and destinies beyond "this visible, diurnal sphere," which the boldest imagination had never conceived. Yet this book, so ancient in date, so venerable in age, so invaluable in its communications, so interesting and varied in its themes, so inimitable in its style, so momentous in its bearing on the condition and prospects of mankind, is in our individual possession, and strange to tell, by men in general is but little studied, and often disregarded. Had our planet never been visited by the light, it is not difficult to conceive what a change would ensue in its condition, should the sun in all its majestic splendor suddenly burst upon its darkness. But we can now gaze on this most stupendous of phenomena—the sun rising and rolling through the heavens—without emotion; we can luxuriate amid the blessings of gratified vision which his light and life-giving beams diffuse around us, without being led to thought, or incited to gratitude. This, however, results from that familiarity which is consequent on gradual perception; and the same law of the mind will direct and aid us in explanation of the subject before us.

Opening up a scene so vast and resplendent, that earth, in all the beauty of her verdant carpeting, the grandeur of her mountain palaces, the sublimity of her ocean, and the solemn magnificence of her starry firmament, seems but false glare and shadow; and conferring benefits so pure and precious, that all temporal blessings are in comparison but as perishable dross,—had the light of revelation just beamed on the world, it is impossible to conceive the effect which would be produced on the mind of high and

serious thought. Contrasting the condition of nations before and since the day-spring from on high visited them, no candid man can deny that, in the moral world; the influence of the Bible is but faintly imaged by the illuminating and fertilizing beams of the material sun. Mankind would suffer less fatally by the extinction of the latter than by the destruction of the former. Yes, hurl the sun from the firmament, and what has been done? Nothing; to the darkness, and the disorder, and the misery, and the ruin, that would ensue on the annihilation of the Bible. Yet how few are there who do not behold the sun of righteousness with indifference; and, while enjoying all the benefits which it imparts, exclude it from their intelligent and adoring regards! Here and there is a man who must investigate the causes of light and darkness, heat and cold, fertility and barrenness; and occasionally we meet with one who turns away from the unsatisfying survey of moral phenomena, and in the conscious futility of all unaided speculation addresses himself with eager diligence to God's revelation; but men generally are devoid of all concern, and however humiliating, no one fails to perceive the aptness of the simile that they are not unlike the brutes which, though warmed and fed, graze the verdant lawn with no feeling of gratitude, and no thought as to the source of their comforts. The reason may be found in the fact that we grow up amid the scenes and in the enjoyment of the blessings of Christianity. Our minds are familiarized from infancy with the disclosures and with the outward influences of revelation, as with material objects and sensible comforts; and thus the interest which it would otherwise elicit is impaired, if not, in many instances, effectually precluded. In regard to some, there is ground for apprehension that their minds are more than familiarized, are prejudiced, in consequence of the injudicious efforts which were made to render their youth acquainted with the doctrines and precepts of the Bible. But whether or not any active emotion predominates, certain it is that our Christian education so familiarizes our minds to the Scriptures, that divine grace is necessary to awaken our interest, and lead us duly to appreciate their importance.

Another reason may be found in the prospective aspect of the Scriptures. Such should be the end of a religious

system for beings that are destined to an existence to which this is no more than the first dawning gleam. But it cannot have escaped observation that it is characteristic of human nature to be absorbed in the present. The Bible is philosophically adapted to elevate man's moral condition; for whatever causes either the future or the past to predominate over the present, raises us in the scale of intellectual existence; still, in addressing us, it has to contend with beings doomed to an incessant struggle with pressing wants, and whose views, in consequence of their physical constitution and relations, being necessarily directed first to outward objects, are wont to be limited by a material horizon. If the Bible only tended to subserve our worldly interests and pursuits by suggesting and illustrating plans and measures for the attainment of such ends as the heart of man naturally covets, it would be read with more avidity than any ambitious man ever read the life of a conqueror or statesman, or any avaricious man the sketch of those who have rapidly accumulated riches. Or did it even countenance sensual pursuits and promise sensual gratifications, many would hang on its pages with the same wanton delight with which the Koran inspires Mahomet's followers. But it respects not the present otherwise than as the present gives a coloring to the future; nor is Christ's kingdom of this world, though godliness is not without its advantages for the life that is. Having a higher end in view than the welfare of the body, or the furtherance of worldly aims, it employs no inferior motives to arrest our attention. On the contrary, regarding us as immortal beings, it holds out to us crowns incorruptible, treasures imperishable, pleasures undecaying—motives which should annihilate all mundane considerations, energize every power of the soul, and urge it on in an unceasing course of spiritual attainments and well-doing. Yet who is so unobservant of the workings of our nature as not to know that in general we are more influenced by present good, though it be trifling, than by the greater good if that be remote; as we are more affected by the little present ills of life, than sedulous to avoid any future, though greater evils?

As the worldly mind is unattracted by its discoveries, so

may the proud be repelled by a book which is so often seen in the hands both of childhood and of unlettered age. Pride excluded the vulgar from the schools of ancient philosophy; and it is painfully evident that the same feeling has kept many a one who overweens, through the fancied strength of his reason, from entering the common school of Christianity. Divine philosophy! hers, in beneficent, glorious distinction from all human systems, is indeed a *common school*. Its gates are open for the children, not only of the rich, but of the poor; nor for the young alone, but for all ages and all classes—for the world of mankind. And he who would be initiated into her sublime mysteries, or grasp her eternal principles, and be fitted for an honorable part on the stage of immortality, must lay his reason in the dust of teachableness: though a "wise man after the flesh," he must enter the same class as the child in worldly wisdom, and learn the alphabet of heaven's language.

It were a strange revelation from the God and Father of all that had been addressed and adapted only to the few of erudite minds; but pride, without pausing to reflect, turns from a volume so repellent with vulgar associations; or closes it with sentiments of contemptuous aversion on meeting with certain truths which cannot be immediately comprehended, or which must be received, if at all, on the authority of the record itself: as if God's word were to be treated as the product of the human mind; or reversing the order of scientific attainments, we must, in matters of divine science, demonstrate propositions before we are able to understand axioms!

In like manner, it is not remembered what doubts and difficulties environed the greatest minds of philosophic antiquity; it is not considered how deplorable was the condition of the world before the Messiah's advent; it is not acknowledged that the Bible has thrown any light on our high moral relations; and, therefore, because reason is now able with so much facility to prove what has been so clearly revealed, not a few turn and assert that a revelation is unnecessary! With as much gratitude as if a child should disown its parent because it is now able to walk by itself, and with as much honesty as if a man should acquaint himself

with the various improvements in the mechanical arts, and then palm them upon some uncivilized people as his own inventions!

With some, who do not reject the Scriptures, pride operates to their disparagement. Thus one has been accustomed to think on theological topics, perhaps has indulged in metaphysical speculation; and now he comes to the sacred volume; but it is not with a spirit of reverence, and docility, and prayer; he comes rather to teach God than to be taught of God. He searches the Scriptures, not to find Christ, but his system; not truth, but his abstract creed. He uses them, not to ascertain their fair and obvious import, but to maintain his own preconceived opinions, to distinguish self, to gratify his pride and love of conspicuity—perhaps to found a school that shall bear his own name, and enlist followers who shall perpetuate his fame. Here is the main cause of such diversities in Scriptural views, and because of these diversities, many do not search the Scriptures. “If others, so great and learned, differ widely in their interpretation of the Scriptures, how vain for us to study them! Or if the Bible leads to such dissimilar tenets, how much better, if we cannot reject it with impunity, that we adhere to that system of doctrine to which we were born, or implicitly receive his teachings whose church we have been brought up to attend.” But while it should not be forgotten that we are individually responsible for our belief, it is not true that the Bible is so framed as to lead to diverse and contrary conclusions. It does not throw its pure and bright image on man’s heart, because he views it through a colored medium. Pride and prejudice deceive him, and thus its true teachings are not unfrequently perverted, and its salutary influence precluded. If, divesting his mind of all prepossessions, he should address himself to the Scriptures with simplicity of purpose, he would find there neither the peculiarities of sect, nor the rites of superstition, nor any of the deductions of philosophy, falsely so called, but the “true God and eternal life.”

There are minds, too, that have been limited in their range of thought by the circle of the natural sciences; and because revelation has not respected the language of science, nor directly aided its discoveries; because it did not make known

the laws by which the heavenly bodies are governed, nor the existence of the western continent, and gives us not the history of other races, and tells not whether the centre of the globe is fire or water; and, at the same time, in its account of the creation, is at variance with their theories; therefore, it could not have emanated from Him who knoweth all things, and is not entitled to their respectful consideration. How absurd! Had the Bible embraced all such matters (and nothing less would have satisfied these lovers of science), it could not have been adapted to the ordinary capacities of the human mind; nor, amid the multiplicity of our necessary pursuits, could man, whose days are as a hand-breadth, have secured time for its perusal. God has so arranged the constitution of his providence, that full scope and activity might be secured to the human mind throughout all generations; and were the Bible a revelation of science, it would supersede the natural use of our faculties, and the mind of society would stagnate. It is too obvious for formal remark that revelation and science are essentially distinct from each other. The latter is necessarily progressive; the former, necessarily absolute and determined: the one being designed to advance society, by affording increasing exercise for man's faculties; the other, to elevate us to the purity of heaven, by unfolding motives to the exercise of our moral affections. In few things is the wisdom of the Bible more strikingly apparent than in its disconnexion with discoveries which man might make, its entire freedom from all scientific or philosophic forms of language, and its profound silence in reference to all matters not distinctly connected with the onward march of humanity towards the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh. Unlike other so-called sacred books, which at once mislead and weary the reader with subtle speculations, mythological representations, and fabulous legends, it never loses sight of the distinction between ethics and physics any more than between fact and fiction. It is a history of man, not of nature; nor yet of all men, but only of the few to whom God in an especial manner made himself known; not a world-history, but the history of the kingdom of heaven on earth—the record of God's acts of creation, and providence, and grace, to the end "that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together

in one all things in Christ." Hence, it is sacred history, in contradistinction from profane; throughout ethical; never introducing anything irrelative, nor employing any means not subservient to its chief end; much less resolving itself into the mere setting forth of physical appearances, or serving to decipher natural signs. If a revelation was made on account of the moral interests of mankind, there was no necessity for any other communications than such as respect the interests and motives of human virtue: and hence it is that the Bible, uttering no gratuitous knowledge, nor ever wantonly stimulating curiosity, is restricted in its communications to what was necessary to be either distinctly or partially known by beings, who, in consequence of the fall, have but one grand object—the salvation of their souls. Even in this respect, revelation is not inconsistent with the analogy of nature. If it does not afford us a clue to certain physical phenomena, neither does reason; if it does not introduce us to the arcana of distant worlds, neither does the telescope of art; and he who on this account would neglect his Bible, to be consistent, should no longer exercise his reason. Go, then, infatuated child of science! and, as you cannot fail to perceive that your own volume sheds no more light than ours on the interior of this or of other worlds, let ours speak when yours is silent, and bring you into converse, not with nature, nor with other beings, but with the Being of beings—the Creator of the universe. Speculate as you may, in vain are all your efforts to pry into the secrets of nature, or divine reasons which have not been revealed. You see but through a glass darkly; and though Christianity may not unseal and purge your mental vision, yet, if you learn of her the things which belong to your peace with God, the time will come when you shall know as you are known.

Others seem to think that God should supersede the necessity of all inquiry on our part; or, if religion be for man, that he should have been endowed with spiritual intuition. It was on this ground that Rousseau founded one of his most plausible objections to the Scriptures. But, aside from the fact that God has made provision for the diffusion of religious knowledge among all classes, by having instituted the ministry of the word, all men alike need its teachings, having

alike lost the image of God in which they were created, and become blinded in their minds. Had man not fallen, a light would burn in his bosom pure as the day-spring from on high; but now he can no more attain unto the knowledge of the truth without the aid of God's word, than he can see God's works without the material light of the sun; and if, in the one case, he must use his eyes, it is no less necessary, in the other, that he should duly exercise the faculties with which he has been endowed. Nor in this respect is revelation at variance with natural religion. Though its principles are inscribed on the whole framework of nature, yet how few, amid the millions of our race, are ever constrained by their silent teachings to bow down before the unseen Ruler of the universe! Virtue, too, utters her voice in the streets, but how seldom do her accents sink into the hearts of the thronging multitude! They *who will* may acquaint themselves with truth and right, but only they; and as well might the fraudulent and profligate deny that there is any such thing as moral principle, as for one to assert, that if God designed that we should know his will, he would have precluded our ignorance. Were religious knowledge resistlessly obtrusive, he who made us would be dealing with us inconsistently with our rational and moral nature, and with the relations which we sustain to his moral government; and hence that book which he has given unto us may be regarded as "a touchstone to try men's honest dispositions;" not a book for the negligent and the slothful, much less for the thoughtless and the perverse.

There are books which we peruse and value, because they either sparkle with the gems of fancy, abound in useful knowledge, or suggest weighty thoughts—*master works* in literature and science; and the more intimate our acquaintance with them, the more do they enlist our interest, and influence our associations. But what uninspired production can challenge comparison with the Bible? Where is there poetry so elevating, history so ancient, narrative so touchingly simple, eloquence so natural, or reasoning more conclusive—a book so diversified in its features, and yet so single in its aim, so wide in its range, so profound in its principles, and so suggestive of the grandest thoughts and the most resplendent visions? There is scarcely a form of composition

in which the human mind has imaged its thoughts and sentiments, that does not find its archetype here. As a volume, it has elicited all the powers of the human intellect, stored every department of human knowledge, and is not only the oldest of books, but the source of all true intellectual light, and life to the world, even as God himself is the Father of our spirits. What must be its meaning and significance, and how wonderful its power to set in motion men's minds, when multitudes have devoted their lives to learning, that they themselves might the better understand and be more able to make others understand better its solemn teachings; when all other wisdom and knowledge have seemed to them nothing worth, except so far as they may subserve its clearer and more successful study; when almost all the books which now crowd the world's great libraries stand in either a direct or indirect relation to this one book. Yet, notwithstanding the vast amount of studious toil that has been for ages expended on its pages, and the unnumbered volumes to which its study has given birth, it is not only unexhausted, but, like nature's own book, inexhaustible in its resources—still full of concealed wonders and choice treasures. Those who have brought to its investigation the energies of the strongest minds, and the attainments of the most profound scholars, have been only the more deeply impressed with the conviction that there are veins of thought to be explored, mines of knowledge requiring still deeper search: as Newton felt in relation to the results of his own physical researches, "like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting himself in now and then finding a smooth pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, while the great sea of truth lay all undiscovered before him." A throng of loving and earnest seekers after truth might testify from their own experience, that in proportion to our knowledge of the Scriptures, is the desire and the effort to know them more fully; and it is nothing but ignorance of them that withholds many from their study, who, in other respects, may be well qualified for the task—in the same manner as the most ignorant of the works of nature are least desirous of investigating her secrets. Had the devotees of intellect only a critical acquaintance with the Bible, they would devote themselves to its study, for this, if no other

reason, that it would give wings to their poetry, fire to their eloquence, data to their histories, and principles to their philosophy, while supplying them with the noblest themes for speculative thought. We are persuaded, that were it not for the holy perfections which it embodies, and the terrors which it unfolds to the worldly mind, or, in other words, the character it bears of being a remedial system for a fallen race, it would hurl to the dust the idol-gods of literature and science, and reign supreme in the head of intellect, as it does in the heart of piety.

But notwithstanding the high order of this Book, and its designed adaptedness to awaken the mind and employ its faculties, some think that it is unnecessary to search the Scriptures. Forgetting that if we are at all amenable to God, we must account for the exercise of those powers which he has given us, and for the use we make of our means of knowledge, they quiet themselves in voluntary ignorance. They know full well, and act accordingly, that there are no worldly attainments without appropriate diligence; that even the gifts of Providence do in no manner encourage indolence or lessen the imperious necessity of exertion; yet in relation to Scriptural truth, they virtually expect knowledge without the trouble of inquiry. It is difficult to account for this unless they act on the unexpressed supposition that by the accidental intercourse of life they shall become proficient in Divine Science, just as we involuntarily imbibe the maxims of worldly policy and expedient morality—a supposition, it needs not to be stated, most preposterous, not only because Christianity, from its being a disclosure of new relations, is peculiar to itself, but a system liable to be perverted, and not to be understood in any other way than by direct personal application and inquiry. That knowledge, moreover, which may be acquired from incidental circumstances is not to be coveted; it is unworthy of confidence and unhappy in its influence. He who, in lieu of educational acquisitions, has fortuitously collected some materials for talk, or has some facility in the use of political verbiage, and consequently become the oracle of a caucus, is apt to think that there is no necessity for him to apply himself studiously; that he—a paragon of self-made greatness! knows as much as any one respecting the science of government or of poli-

tical economy, though others may have applied to these branches years of laborious study. And thus it is that narrow and superficial views on religious subjects, obtained not from personal knowledge of the Scriptures, but from accidental intercourse, inflate and infatuate the mind; and hence, individuals are not wanting who, though far from being well informed on any subject, and whose sole notions of religion have been gathered from some one more ignorant or less conscientious than themselves, or perhaps from an occasional glance at the Scriptures, sufficient to enable them to quote texts without regard to their connexion, or even a clear understanding of the words employed—never search the Scriptures in the sense which Christ attached to his injunction; nor do they deem it necessary, nor would they acknowledge, nor could they be convinced that any man, though he may have devoted his life to their investigation, and may have brought to the task all the requisite qualifications, both of mind and heart, could rectify their notions, much less extend the limits of their knowledge!

It is worthy of a passing thought, whether erroneous views of the nature of religion—as something which originates in feeling, and is nourished and exhibited only by feeling—may not have contributed to the same result. There is, indeed, no true religion without the exercise of our affections, and the quickening of our moral sensibilities. Man is a compound being; and any religious system to be adapted to his nature, while it enlists his heart, must minister food to his mind. To exalt either the head or the heart above the other, is to violate the proportions of our being. The class to which we refer attach an undue importance to their feelings; they are ever looking into their hearts, and neglecting to inform their minds. If they do not despise knowledge, they turn from it, as of no use to them, not calculated to rouse them to a higher and more delectable pitch of excitement. Hence, whatever their degree of faith, they annex not knowledge by the diligent study of God's Word. They read only such religious books as will gratify the morbid cravings of their hearts, not books "for instruction in righteousness." Time with them is felt to be unprofitably spent, if they must listen to an expository or a doctrinal discourse. They can listen with patience to no preacher of

the Word even, unless he be an Æolus, and letting loose the winds of declamation, will blow them into flame. In the name of reason, what kind of heaven do such anticipate? Can it be that glorious world which Christianity has disclosed to the eye of faith? for *there* there are intellects that not only glow with love, but tower in knowledge: ceaselessly engaged are they not only in celebrating the praises, but in contemplating the perfections, penetrating the works, and tracing the ways of the boundless Intelligence!

Sincerity of religious purpose may coexist with very defective views, but one certain evidence of a change of heart must be wanting when there is no desire for Scriptural knowledge, no love for the study of God's word. True conversion has, in repeated instances, given date to a course of biblical study which has resulted in the most valuable contributions to religious literature. It might, indeed, be laid down as a rule that they who are most under the influence of Christian faith and principle, are the most intent on Scriptural attainments. Yet there are exceptions from such a rule; and these may arise from the want of early training, or of previous habits of reflection; or from a distrust of their own mental powers, and a reluctance, perhaps humble reluctance, to search the Scriptures for themselves, lest they should ignorantly wrest them: or it may arise from a superstitious notion, that the careful possession of the Bible, the love and praise of the book itself, may make amends for their neglect of its claims on their daily perusal, and even insure their salvation. This impression, strange as it may seem, is not uncommon, and may be traced back to the Jews who enlarged the hem of their garments, and made broad their phylacteries; or its parallel may be found in the case of some of the ancient heathens who wore an amulet on the breast as a safeguard against accidental evils, and the surety of success. To account for it, we need only advert to the obvious principle of associated ideas. It was a very natural suggestion of the woman, of whom mention is made in the gospel, that if she only touched the Lord's garment she should be healed; it was an easy error, into which many fell, of worshipping the supposed cross on which Jesus was crucified, or the relics of those who had been pre-eminent for sanctity in life, and triumph in death; it is a pardonable

weakness to regard as holy the very bricks and mortar of the edifice which has been consecrated to a holy God ; and why should it be a matter of surprise that some attach a talismanic virtue to the Bible ? Associating with it all that is holy in living, and peaceful in dying ; identifying it with its blessed author, and its glorious end, we are apt to fancy that if we are not rendered better, we are, at least, the safer, for simply possessing and preserving so invaluable a treasure. Among the class of nominal believers, there is scarce one who would not be disturbed by the thought of being without a Bible, though it is seldom read. Possibly, it may be glanced at on a Sabbath morn, or introduced into a sick-room, but it is never searched. A moment's reflection would break up the delusion ; but in some way the simple fact of owning a Bible, though it be an unopened, a neglected Bible, if it does not inspire hope, quiets conscience ; and hence persons who may not, while at home, have regarded the Scriptures, seldom fail to procure a copy when they are going abroad ; though such too often return in nowise more acquainted with its pages than they were before.

But the same feeling that has often led to the rejection of Christ, and that withholds many, though they have been enlightened by the truth, from publicly avowing their belief, may interfere with the duty of searching the Scriptures. It has been the aim of infidels, especially those most devoid of the logical faculty, to brand religion with opprobrious epithets. They can of course have no influence where there is discernment and candor ; but they do bear sway over the weak and the shallow—minds so light as to be blown in any direction by a laugh with less seeming power of resistance than a feather, the sport of every breath—over those, too, whose only ambition is to retain the favorable opinion of companions more wicked, though less weak, than themselves. Thus, such would be ashamed to have any suppose that they could ever read the Scriptures : should they accidentally be seen so engaged, in all probability, a blush would suffuse the face which even detection in polluting pleasures might not induce. And why ashamed ? Lest it should be suspected that they are serious and about to become religious—an act more disreputable in the view of some than most breaches of morality !

But we pass to assign another reason. Whom do we select as our associates, or whose company do we prefer? Not those whose views and feelings are at variance with our own, or who oppose us at every step of our business and pleasure. Company, if sought by us, must be agreeable to our taste and conducive to our enjoyment; where nothing will be uttered to disturb our tranquillity or dissatisfy us with self. It is human nature to dislike and avoid those who may have convinced us of error, or pointed out our faults. Let it then be supposed that Christ and his apostles were still upon earth, to be seen several hours every day, not in any remote place, but in the midst of our crowded haunts; or in "an upper chamber" beneath which were publicans and sinners—men of the world—each one intent on some earth-born interest. Which room would be the most frequented? The upper one? What! where the holy Jesus is, with his holy apostles? where God's presence is seen and felt, and his voice is heard and obeyed? How happens it then that so many now prefer the haunts of worldliness to the assemblies of the saints, the wages of iniquity rather than the ways of holiness—the news of the day to the great things which God hath written unto us? The Bible decides the point. While it invites us to the company of Christ and his disciples, to the presence of God and of angels; how few avail themselves of the opportunity; how many prefer to remain where nothing clashes with their pursuits and habits! It is a fact, carrying its own testimony in favor of the divine origin of the Bible, that no wicked man can turn over its pages without perceiving its striking contrariety to all his sentiments and actions—the secret evils of his own condition, and the awful purity of that Being with whom he has to do. Its holiness pains his vision; its threatenings of wrath to the uttermost, appal his spirit. He seems to hear a voice which says unto him, *Thou art the man! this night thy soul shall be required of thee!*

More spiritual in its drift and meaning than the Old Testament, the New affords no scope for diversion, and no ground for self-complacency. It reveals the sinner to himself, strips him of all subterfuges, convinces him of his lost condition, urges him to the work of immediate repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence

they who cannot quiet their consciences without a hebdomadal glance at the Scriptures, generally turn over to the Old Testament. Hence it is also that the only people inattentive to their sacred books are to be found among Christians. Where there is one Jew who does not regard the Old Testament with reverence, or a Mahometan who has not memorized large portions of the Koran, or a Hindoo Brahmin who is not fanatically attached to the Shaster, we may find a multitude of nominal Christians living in habitual neglect of the Bible.

The cause of this may be primarily traced to the absence of all serious reflection: for, let one only reflect on the constitution of his being, and he must desire to know his Maker, and to lift the veil that shrouds from his view the limitless future. No speculation is so momentous, so absorbing, as that respecting his being and destination. The more he reflects, the more is he interested and enthralled. His inquiries, however diligent, are unsuccessful, and yet resumed again and again. Anything but incertitude in such a relation. No sacrifice would be too great, if only all doubt could be resolved. To be relieved from the wrestling uneasiness of his thoughts, he feels, at times, that he would throw off the incumbrances of flesh and blood, and venture alone to explore the dark unknown. See, with what deep earnestness he unfolds those systems which purport to illumine subjects so inexplicably profound. See, how patiently he listens, if so be that amid the multitude of voices he may hear an answer to his anxious inquiries. Is it reasonable to suppose that a mind thus stirred would reject a revelation from heaven? With what rapture would he hail the volume, if accompanied with sure and certain evidence that it had descended from the source supreme of all light and love! how would he search its pages as for hid treasures! and with how much more than Archimedian emphasis might he say on solving the problem of his being, "I have found it!" "I have found it!"

Reflecting long and deeply on the nature and design of their being, the wiser heathen felt and acknowledged their want of a Divine teacher; and all men of serious thought, at the present day, turn with satisfaction from the wearisomeness and the futility of unaided reason to a system which so

clearly illumines life and immortality. In all the world, no book but the Bible can instruct us in the great things pertaining to God and the soul. And were there more solitary reflection, more serious and intelligent deference to those high inquiries which spring, never to be repressed, from the very constitution of our being—we had almost said, the very consciousness of mind—the holy Scriptures would be more anxiously and diligently studied. But men in general think little more of their being and destination than the very brutes that perish; far the greater proportion are averse to all serious, solitary thought. If only their senses be gratified, they are not unhappy; if reflection be but dissipated in the whirl of business or of amusement, they are content.

It becomes not to such a question—In what way sin can be consistently pardoned, though this has ever been, and must be, an inexplicable difficulty to any one unenlightened by revelation. The consciousness of sin, while it led some of old to rely on vain sacrifices, plunged others into the gulf of despair. If some inquired whether they should offer up the fruit of their bodies for the sin of their souls, others contended that pardon could not consist with pure justice; and what should we have known of the method of pardon, had it not been for the light which is so clearly reflected from the Scriptures? The world is no longer doomed to feel its guilt, and to despair of pardon. Let man be now convinced of sin;—he may realize the purity and the justice of God; his own necessary liability to punishment; the insufficiency of either repentance, confession, or amendment to cancel his guilt; but all this has no other effect than to urge his accelerated footsteps to the cross of Christ. He beholds the bleeding victim; he ponders in astonishment and awe the embodied exemplification of the great truth, that God may be just, and yet the justifier of him that believes in Christ; and if he believes not, it is for joy. What scales have fallen from his eyes!—what a burden has been lifted from his soul!—what peace pervades his mind so lately harassed by doubt, and tormented by fear! Precious beyond utterance is the gospel to him now; and it is not enough for him to adore the great God, even his Saviour—he henceforth dwells, and with glowing energies, on the mystery of godliness. What a theme for study this! If

angels pass by suns and systems to look into these things, how does it become sinners to search the Scriptures! Is it so that the Bible opens up to us the medium, and the only medium, of man's restoration to the Divine favor? Why, then, are so few intent on its blessed teachings? Because so few comparatively have any conviction of their real moral condition. They do not feel that they are sinners—do not consider what an awful ruin awaits the finally impenitent, or it would be to them individually a question of all-absorbing, agonizing interest, "Are these things so?" "What must I do to be saved?"

But, aside from all other reasons, the study of the Scriptures, as any other study, requires a corresponding disposition. We cannot enjoy, much less appreciate, works of taste, unless we have the poet's eye; nor practise music with delight without an ear attuned to melody and sweet sounds; nor could it be of any service did any one devote himself to the science of mind, or of numbers, that has not a fondness for those branches of study. The same holds true in relation to the study of the Bible. To be attracted by its discoveries; to weigh its principles; to dwell on its songs, its histories, its narrations, its familiar letters, its prophetic visions, and precious promises, there must be a disposition to know God and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent—to hate sin, and love holiness. Man has all the requisite faculties and means for the attainment of Scriptural knowledge; and though, in occasional instances, his literary sympathies may lead him to descant on the beauties and sublimities of the Bible, yet is he depraved: he loves darkness rather than light; and this is the reason, the grand reason—for all others may be resolved into it—that he turns away with indifference, if not aversion, from the inspired records of God's holy will.

To evade the force of this conclusion, it is not unusual with a certain class of minds to fall back on some infidel position. But he who has never searched the Scriptures has no right to question their truth; and in so doing, he only convicts himself of being governed more by passion than by reason—perhaps betrays his credulity in having grounded his scepticism on the bald assertions of some infidel, as ignorant of the Bible as he is himself. It is clear that he who has not

given to this book that degree of attention which the question respecting its origin imperatively demands, is not only not competent to decide as to its claims or its merits, but lost to all sense of shame, if he does. He himself is false rather than the Word which he presumes to judge; and what is his opinion worth compared with that of those whose study of the Scriptures has led them to the firm conviction of their divine origin? Let it be supposed that when Columbus returned from his voyage, and laid his discovery before his king, some one of the courtiers who had never been beyond the narrow limits of Spain, had dogmatically affirmed that the report was false—too marvellous to be true. In what light should we have regarded the king had he denounced Columbus as an impostor? Or, if the science of astronomy were now under consideration, whose opinion should we adopt?—his, who had devoted a long life of investigation, and calculation, and experiment, to the subject? No, if we treated this science as the infidel does the science of the divine will, we should listen with more respectful deference to him who, so far from having studied astronomy, has never opened a volume on the subject. It is impossible, however, by any comparison, to convey an adequate conception of his presumption and folly, who, having never searched the Messiah's testimony, yet denounces the Scriptures as false. Well may every intelligent believer, and especially he who has made the Scriptures the subject of diligent and profound search, say to such a one, as Sir Isaac Newton said in reply to Dr. Halley, who had ventured to remark disrespectfully of the Christian religion, *I have studied these things; you have not*. Such, too, was the testimony of no less a man than the late Daniel Webster. "I have read through the entire Bible many times. I now make a practice to go through it once a year. It is the book of all others for lawyers and divines; and I pity the man that cannot find in it a rich supply of thought and of rules for his conduct. It fits man for life—it prepares him for death."

ART. III.—LECTURES ON THE APOCALYPSE, Critical, Expository, and Practical, delivered before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1848. By Charles Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Public Orator of the University. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1852.

THE zealous efforts of the Catholics, within a few years, to re-establish themselves in Great Britain, the rapidity with which they have multiplied their congregations, and the accessions they have received from the establishment, have had the effect to recall the attention of the Protestants to the great question, which had in a measure passed from the general mind, whether the Roman is a true church; and especially whether the Papacy is the power that is denominated in the New Testament the man of sin, and represented in the Apocalypse by the harlot of Babylon and the beast of two horns; and has led to the publication of a large number of volumes, in which the subject is discussed with ability, and the most unanswerable evidences presented, that the portrait drawn in the Scriptures of the apostate church, meets, in all its features, an exact resemblance in the Roman hierarchy? The result is, that the Protestants, as a body, have become far better acquainted with the prophecies which depict the character and foreshow the doom of that usurping power; and writers who differ widely on other points, concur in the belief that the hour of her judgment is at hand. This is a very striking and a very encouraging effect. It indicates that however delusions may generally prevail, great numbers are preparing for the conflict which is approaching, and will be ready when the crisis comes, to maintain their allegiance to Christ, and display the steadfastness and patience which are then to be the characteristics of all his disciples, and are to be rewarded with crowns.

Of the writers, however, who have taken a part in this controversy—whose works we have seen—no one seems to us to have placed his expositions of the predictions of Daniel and John respecting the apostate church, on a proper ground; nor to have realized that, before entering on their construction, the

principles should be ascertained and settled, by which the language and symbols that are the media of their predictions, are to be interpreted. That question which is preliminary to all others, and without a just determination of which no satisfactory explication of these prophets is practicable, has, it would seem, scarcely attracted their notice. They appear not to have suspected but that Daniel and John are to be interpreted in the same manner as the revelations which are made through mere language instead of symbols; and this is a conspicuous defect in Dr. Wordsworth's work. He has stated no law whatever for the explication of the symbols of the Apocalypse. He says nothing of the importance of just notions of the relation in which they are used. He seems to regard them as employed like comparisons and metaphors for illustration merely, not as representative agents; and to suppose that their meaning is to be determined by other parts of the sacred word, in which the same objects are spoken of, and the same terms are used, rather than by their own nature. The result is, that in attempting to interpret some of the most important of the visions of the Apocalypse, he scarcely looks to the symbols to ascertain what it is which they reveal; but turns to other parts of the sacred volume, in which some of the principal terms employed in the description of them occur, and takes these as a key to their import. He consequently sees in those parts of the prophecy no new or peculiar revelation, but only a repetition of what had been communicated before.

It is owing to this failure to perceive that symbols are the instruments of the revelation that is made in the Apocalypse, that they are employed on principles that are peculiar to themselves, and that they have specific laws, that he has adopted the notion that the church is to be taken as a guide in the interpretation of the prophecies, and fallen into the errors in his constructions which we propose to point out.

He makes it the object of his two first lectures to show that no revelation is made in the Apocalypse of a reign of Christ and the saints on the earth during the period denoted by a thousand years. To sustain this position, he alleges, in the first place, that the doctrine of a millennium was introduced into the church from the synagogue, or was founded on Judaic interpretations of the ancient prophecies and tradi-

tions ; not on the teachings of the New Testament.—Pp. 24–28. No mistake, however—as we had occasion to show in a previous number, vol. iii. pp. 127–134, could be greater. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Lactantius, expressly found their doctrines of the millennium on the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse, and the prophecies of Isaiah, chap. lxx., Zech. xiv., and other passages of the Old Testament, that are alleged by millenarians as foreshowing the reign of Christ and the saints on the earth. Not a hint is uttered by them that they were led to their belief in that reign by Jewish interpretations or traditions ; or that they drew their notions of it in any manner from the opinions that were entertained by the Jews of the reign of the Messiah. Nor are any proofs presented by Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, or Augustine, who brand the doctrine as Judaic, that it was drawn from the constructions placed by the Rabbis on the Old Testament prophecies respecting the Messiah's reign. There is not an intimation in their discussions on the subject, that the millenarians against whom they wrote, offered any other ground of their belief than the teachings of the Scriptures, and reports that had descended to them of the sayings of Christ and the apostles. So far from it, they show in the clearest manner that the whole question between them and the Chiliasts was a question of interpretation. They represent the error, as they deemed it, of the Chiliasts, as resulting from their putting a literal construction on the prophecies respecting the coming of the Messiah, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the reign of Christ and the saints for a thousand years ; and the means accordingly which they employed to refute them, was simply the ascription of a different and a tropological sense to those predictions. They made no attempt to show beyond that, that the opinions of Jewish Rabbis, who were not believers in Christ, were not entitled to be received by Christians as of authority, and a key to the meaning of the New Testament ; which would have been natural, had the Chiliasts founded their faith on those opinions. The supposition indeed that they drew their notions of the millennium in any measure from that source, is absurd and solecistical in the utmost degree ; inasmuch as the Rabbis, who were rejecters of Christ, had no conception of a millennium like that revealed in the Apocalypse, in which

the Chiliasts believed; a millennium during which Satan was to be bound and imprisoned that he should not deceive the nations; and martyrs who had been put to death for "the testimony of Jesus" were to reign. How could they who did not believe that Jesus was the Christ, believe in a millennium in which martyrs, who had been beheaded, because they had testified to his Messiahship and preached his gospel, were to reign in glory with him? Can any fancy be more preposterous? The pretence, then, that the millenarians of the first four centuries drew their doctrine of Christ's reign on the earth with his saints for a thousand years, from the Jewish Synagogue, and attempted to deduce it from the Scriptures by unnatural and false constructions, is wholly mistaken.

He next alleges as a proof that there is no authority in the Apocalypse for the doctrine of the millennium, that the imputation to it of such a revelation was the reason that the prophecy fell into disrepute in the third and fourth centuries, and was rejected by some from the catalogue of inspired writings. But that—if it were so—instead of confirming, would confute what he attempts to prove from it. For why should they have pronounced the Apocalypse a fabrication, because it was appealed to by the Chiliasts as authority for their doctrine of the millennium, unless it were on the ground that it actually presents a revelation of the reign of Christ and the saints on the earth for a thousand years, so clearly, that they had no method of escaping it, but to deny that the book was authentic and inspired. If they were able to show that, properly interpreted, it contains no revelation of a reign of Christ and the saints, the mere imputation of such a prediction would be no reason for branding it as a fabrication, and excluding it from the canon of authentic Scriptures. If then it was rejected on that ground, it is a proof that it was felt that it presented precisely such a revelation of the reign of Christ as the Chiliasts ascribed to it. And that that was in truth the reason of the disbelief and aversion with which it was regarded by Caius the Presbyter, and some others, at the close of the second and beginning of the third century, is made highly probable by the fact that the tropological or allegoristic method of interpretation, which was subsequently employed to get rid of it, had not then been invented by

Origen; and that after that arbitrary system had been promulgated and gained the sanction of the leading doctors of the church, the inspiration of the prophecy was no longer doubted, notwithstanding the twentieth chapter, taken according to the literal meaning of the language, specifically announces a reign of Christ and the saints for a thousand years.

He offers it as a third proof that a millennium is not fore-shown in the Apocalypse, that Origen, Dionysius, Jerome, and Augustine assign to the vision of the living and reigning martyrs (Rev. xx. 1-6) a merely spiritual or allegorical meaning. But in this he takes for granted the point in debate, that their construction of the passage is correct. Origen, Jerome, and Augustine do not deny that the prediction of the restoration of the Israelites, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the first resurrection, and the reign of the Messiah, teach, if taken in their literal sense, what the Chiliasts ascribe to them. They admit it: but they maintain that that is not their true sense. They hold that to put such a construction on them, is to assign them a mere literal and physical meaning, such as the Jews ascribed to the prophecy of the happiness of their nation (Isaiah lxxv.), when the new heavens and new earth are created, Jerusalem is made a rejoicing, and her people a joy, and there is no more want, captivity, nor war, but peace and safety are to prevail, and the wolf and the lamb are to feed together, and the lion eat straw like the ox; which they denounce as literal and carnal, and thence affirm, that, instead of being taken in that material sense, such corporeal and earthly things are to be construed as mere representatives or figures of analogous spiritual gifts. This is stated at large by Origen, in his *Principia*, lib. ii. c. 11; by Jerome, in his *Commentaries on Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah*; and by Augustine, in his *City of God*, lib. xx. c. 7, 8, and 9. But the mere fact that these fathers held that opinion, is no proof that it is right, any more than the fact, that directly the opposite view was entertained by Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and others, demonstrates that their judgment is just. The question, which theory is right, is to be determined by the laws of interpretation; and when tried by that test, the notions advocated by Origen, instead of being verified, are overthrown; as the allegorization or spiritualization

to which he resorted, in place of having any ground in the usage of language, or the principles of symbolization, is wholly arbitrary and subversive of the true sense of the divine word.

He alleges, as a fourth proof of his proposition, that the doctrine of a millennium has been rejected by the church. To establish this, he first adduces its rejection by the fathers whom we have already mentioned — Origen, Dionysius, Jerome, and Augustine. But the fact that they rejected it, by allegorizing or spiritualizing the passages in which it is taught, is no more proof that it is not taught in those passages, than the fact that, by that method of interpretation, they ascribed a false sense to many other passages, is a proof that those passages do not teach the doctrines which they truly convey.

He adduces the fact, that it is not embodied in either the Apostolic, the Nicene, or the Athanasian creed, as an evidence that it is not revealed in the Apocalypse. But its omission from those creeds, which were not written till the fourth century, no more indicates that it is not a doctrine of the Apocalypse, than the omission from them of many other important truths and revelations is a proof that they are not contained in the sacred volume. There is no mention in those formularies of the fall, of the institution of sacrifices, of the deluge, of the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt, of the giving of the law at Sinai, of the appointment of the Aaronic priesthood, of the apostasy of the Israelites;—there is no mention in them of the predictions in the New Testament of the apostasy of the church, of the persecution of the true worshippers through a long series of ages, and of the destruction of the persecuting powers, by the direct interposition of Christ at his coming. Does the omission of these great facts and revelations prove that they are not really mentioned in the sacred volume? Why not, as much as the omission from them of the reign of Christ and the saints on earth during the thousand years, proves that that reign is not revealed in the Apocalypse?

He alleges, as a further evidence of his position, that, after its rejection by Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, the doctrine of the millennium was unknown to the church for a thousand years. But that is no more a proof that it is not

revealed in the Apocalypse, than its rejection, through a false method of interpretation, by Origen, Jerome, and Augustine is; for the method of spiritualization by which they attempted to erase it from the Scriptures, was employed by the principal writers of the church through the whole period that intervened, to the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Besides, on the nationalization of the church by Constantine, it was held by many of the clergy, that the predicted triumph of Christ's kingdom over its enemies had received its fulfilment; and the popes, on reaching the acme of their power, claimed that they were the vicegerents of Christ, and that his reign on the earth, and the reign of his saints, had their accomplishment in them. Does the suppression and perversion of the doctrine of Christ's millennial reign by these extraordinary means, through a long tract of ages, prove that it is not revealed in the Apocalypse?

He adds, as another confirmation of his position, that the doctrine of the millennium was rejected by the Reformers. That statement, however, requires very important limitations. Was the doctrine of Christ's millennial reign rejected by Archbishop Cranmer? Was it by the authors of Edward Sixth's catechism? Was it by Bishop Latimer? He alleges that the church of England rejected it. But there is no renunciation of it in the Thirty-nine Articles. Nor does she, as Dr. Wordsworth represents, condemn it, "by acknowledging the authority of the creeds." As those creeds make no mention of it, how can her acknowledgment of them involve a condemnation of it, any more than it involves a condemnation of any of the other facts or revelations presented in the Scriptures that are not enumerated in those formularies? He avers that it was "censured by the most eminent among the continental reformers, Luther, Melancthon, and others, in the Augsburg Confession. Unfortunately, however, in his translation, he has made an important change in the passage to which he refers, by inserting the term *general* before the word resurrection, so as to make it read, "We condemn those who are now propagating the *Judaistic Opinion* that before the *general* resurrection of the dead, the saints will reign on earth." The language of the original is; *Damnant et alios qui nunc spargunt Judaicas opiniones, quod ante resurrectionem mortuorum, pii regnum mundi*

occupaturi sint, ubique oppressis impiis. They also condemn others who now spread the Judaistic opinion that *before the resurrection of the dead*, the pious are to possess the empire of the world, the impious everywhere being subdued, or put down. But this is not the doctrine either of the ancient or the modern millenarians, but of the fanatics of Munster, and others of that period, who held that the reign of the saints on earth was to *precede* Christ's coming and the resurrection of the holy dead, not to follow them, as is the representation of the Apocalypse, and the doctrine of both modern and ancient millenarians; and it is that notion, not the doctrine held by pre-millennialists, that was censured by the church of England in the article, to which he refers, of the year 1552. "They that go about to revive the fable of heretics called Millenarii be repugnant to holy Scripture, and cast themselves into a Jewish dotage." That "fable" was the fable entertained by the enthusiasts of Munster, that they, —not Christ and the risen saints—were the kings of the thousand years; and is as unlike the doctrine maintained by the premillennialists as the theory held by Dr. Wordsworth himself is. The reprobation of it by the church of England was therefore no reprobation of the apocalyptic doctrine that the millennium is to *follow*, not precede the first resurrection; and that it is Christ and his *risen* saints who are then to reign, not—as Muncer and Cnipperdoling held—men in the natural body.

Dr. Wordsworth proceeds in this argument on the assumption that the views that have prevailed in the church are to be taken as expressing the doctrines of the Scriptures on the subject, and received on the ground of her authority. He says:—

"As we have seen, this doctrine is repugnant to the teaching of the church. The church is the guardian of Scripture; it is also its divinely appointed interpreter; and that man has but little judgment, and ought to have less authority, who sets up his own private opinions against the public judgment and authority of the church." —P. 47.

"Remember that Almighty God has not only given us Scripture as our rule, but he has also vouchsafed to us a guide for its application, namely, the Christian church. In the words of our twentieth article, 'the church hath authority in controversies of faith.' Do not imagine

that any *private* interpretations of Scripture are to be received as Scripture, if they are opposed to what the church declares in her creeds to be the true sense of Scripture. And inasmuch as the doctrine of the millennium is inconsistent with Scripture, as interpreted by the church in the creeds, let no private persuasion beguile you to adopt it. By so doing, you would not only embrace a doctrine fraught with pernicious results, but you would be giving up the fundamental principle of Christianity. Scripture, as interpreted by the church, would cease to be your rule of faith; and when this foundation is gone, the whole fabric falls."—P. 57.

This is a very extraordinary doctrine to be advanced by a Protestant minister, and especially in a volume directed mainly against the Catholic hierarchy, which, in the exercise of the very power he here ascribes to the church, affects authoritatively to determine the sense of the Scriptures in favor of her false and blasphemous doctrines. It is not "the fundamental principle of Christianity" that the church has the power to determine what the sense of the Scriptures is, and to place its members under obligation to receive her constructions or decrees as expressing their true meaning. In what part of the Bible is the doctrine taught that the investiture of the ministers of the church with such absolute authority over the truths of revelation, is "the fundamental principle of Christianity?" Instead, it is the distinguishing doctrine of the papacy; and it is by the power she has thus usurped of determining what the faith of her subjects shall be, that she has caused her false dogmas to be received as the doctrines of the sacred word. But it is not the doctrine of the Bible. The commission Christ gave his disciples was to teach all nations to observe all things *which he had commanded*, not to interpose betwixt him and the nations, and determine for them what was to be received as the import of his commands. They were to teach those commands themselves, and in the language in which he expressed them; not to give a gloss of theirs that was to be taken by their hearers as embodying their meaning. Paul accordingly says: "Christ sent me to preach *the gospel*; not with wisdom of words"—or in the rhetorical method that was esteemed by the Greeks—"lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." And he adds: "We have received, not the

spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God; which also we speak, not in the words taught by man's wisdom, but taught by the Holy Ghost, expressing spiritual things by spiritual words." He thus communicated identically that and nothing else as from God, which God had communicated to him. And when he expressed judgments that were not received directly from the Spirit, he presented them as the work of his own mind in contradistinction from commands from God, as in respect to the expediency of marriage—1 Corin. vii. 6-9, 25-28. And such are the views of the work of the ministers of the church that are given in every part of the New Testament, and especially in the epistles to Timothy and Titus; in the letters to the angels or messengers of the churches in the Apocalypse; and in the delineations in that prophecy of the work of the witnesses for Jesus. They were beheaded for uttering the testimony for Jesus, and for preaching the word of God. There is no hint that they assumed the right of determining for those whom they addressed what they should receive as the true sense of the divine word, and claimed that their judgment should be accepted as an infallible and authoritative exponent of its meaning. Such a claim is in fact a claim to absolute authority over the word of God. It implies that the Most High has surrendered his rights to the ministers of the church, and that their judgment of his will is to be substituted in the place of his will itself as the law of those whom they teach. It is, therefore, in effect, a usurpation of his throne. It makes those ministers virtually the lawgivers of the church, and the objects of faith and homage in the place of God; and that has been the actual result in the Greek and Latin communions where the right has been usurped of authoritatively determining the belief and worship of the church. Those hierarchies have seated themselves in the temple of God, arrogated his prerogatives as lawgiver, and made themselves the real objects of homage. And Dr. W., in conceding to them that right, in effect, concedes that those whom they teach are bound to receive all their false doctrines and idolatrous rites as true.

Dr. Wordsworth deserts, therefore, in this part of his argument, the ground both of the Bible and of Protestant-

ism, and is wholly unjustifiable in alleging the fact that the church for a long period has not acknowledged the doctrine of the millennium, or has rejected it, as a proof that it is not taught in the Apocalypse, and as placing us under obligation also to disown and reject it. The judgments of doctors, of synods, and of councils, are only the judgments of men, and, even if correct, are not the reasons that the truths which they express are to be received as the truths which God has communicated to us in the Scriptures; but the sole and absolute ground that we are to believe them is, that they are taught us by God in his word. The proper office of doctrines, articles, and confessions, is—not to determine us in respect to what we are to receive as taught in the Scriptures, but to serve as statements and expressions of the doctrines which we have already satisfied ourselves the word of God teaches.

He winds up his attempts to prove that the doctrine of the millennium is not contained in the Apocalypse with the following extraordinary passage:—

“We should have been unmindful of our duty, if we had not entered on this subject with feelings of reverent devotion for the divine word, and with an earnest desire of confirming your faith in its integrity and inspiration, and of increasing your gratitude to God for endowing our own church with grace and wisdom, and enabling her to be a faithful witness and keeper of Holy Writ.

“What a high dignity is this! What a glorious privilege! Yes: and believing with her that the word of Almighty God is *yes and amen*, so that it cannot be inconsistent with itself; and that, like its divine author, it has no variableness nor shadow of turning; and that in her words, ‘the doctrine of the millennium is repugnant to Holy Scripture; and that if it could be proved from the Apocalypse, the Apocalypse would not be Scripture; and knowing as we do from the history of the church that whenever this doctrine has been imputed to the Apocalypse, the church has been in peril of losing the Apocalypse; and seeing with sorrow that this doctrine has been revived in this our day, and is now propagated with industrious zeal, therefore we would say with affectionate and respectful earnestness, to all who suppose that they find the millennium in the Apocalypse, —Be on your guard; beware lest you lose the Apocalypse. Take heed lest you cause others to lose it. Remember the belief of one has produced the rejection of the other.”—P. 39.

More exceptionable notions, in our judgment, never passed from the pen of a Protestant writer. Here is a specific declaration that if it can be proved from the Apocalypse that there is a revelation in it that Christ and his saints are to reign on the earth during a thousand years, that itself will demonstrate that the book is not the word of God! Can prejudice or infatuation possibly go further? The question whether the Apocalypse is the word of God, is not to be determined, it seems, by the fact that it was written and delivered to the churches by John as a communication from heaven; that it bears the most indisputable marks of its divine origin; that it has ever been received by the church generally as a revelation; and that its divinity has been demonstrated by the fulfilment of a large portion of its great predictions. If it foreshows the reign of Christ and his risen saints on the earth for a thousand years, these proofs of its inspiration are to go for nothing, and it is to be rejected as an impious fabrication! An extraordinary display truly of what he denominates a "reverent devotion for the divine word!" If his prepossessions are contravened by it; if the disclosures which it makes of the future do not accord with his notions of what it becomes the Almighty to make known, the book, no matter with what signals it is stamped of its divine origin, is to be rejected! Can Dr. Wordsworth have realized the import of his representations? Could he possibly have arrogated for the church a more absolute authority over the word of God? Could he have more effectually claimed the prerogative of determining by his will whether a revelation from the Most High shall be received as such or not? What more comprehensive assumption of power to decide what shall be held as of divine authority, in respect to doctrine and worship, was ever made by the papacy? No wonder that, animated by such a bewildering prejudice, he is unable to see any traces in the Apocalypse of a revelation of Christ's reign on the earth! What an exemplification of the extremity to which anti-millenarianism is driven to sustain itself! No matter how clearly that reign is foreshown in a vision which John has recorded, it must be erased from the Apocalypse, or else that revelation itself must be discarded! Instead of this astounding infatuation, counsels directly the reverse of those which he utters should have

been urged by him on his hearers. Beware, he should have said, how you allow prepossessions to sway you in determining what can or cannot have been revealed by God. Take care that you are not beguiled into the fancy that the doctrine of a millennium is a mere Jewish fable, and cannot be contained in the Apocalypse; or that, if found there, it will prove that the work is not a genuine prophecy; for as there is a vision in it, in which it is clearly foreshown that Christ and his risen saints are to reign a thousand years on the earth, that groundless prepossession will naturally lead you to reject the Apocalypse and brand it as a fabrication; and therefore debar you from the blessing which is promised to those who read and hear its records, and keep the things that are written in it.

He avers, as a further proof that a millennium is not foreshown in the Apocalypse, that it is owing to a false view of the plan of that prophecy that millenarians have thought it reveals a reign of Christ and his saints on the earth. He says:—

“But the advocate of millenarian doctrines may, perhaps, allege that he does not doubt the word of God; that he clings to it; that he believes the Apocalypse to be Scripture; and that he finds the millennium there. It is no fault of mine, he may proceed to say, if this doctrine displeases some, or leads *them* to reject the Apocalypse. I believe the doctrine, and I receive the book; and I love the book because it contains the doctrine. I appeal to the twentieth chapter. There Jesus Christ descends from heaven; he chains Satan for a thousand years; the souls of the just live; this is the first resurrection; they reign with Christ a thousand years on earth in the New Jerusalem; they are set on thrones, and judgment is given them; then Satan is loosed for a little season to deceive the nations, to gather them to battle, to war with the saints; and then Satan is vanquished and bound for evermore; and the rest of the dead are raised, and the universal judgment ensues; and the righteous ascend to heaven, and the wicked are cast into hell.

“Here, he affirms, is the doctrine of the millennium, and I hold that doctrine, he says, because I find it in the Apocalypse, and because I believe the Apocalypse to be the word of God.”—P. 40.

Here the point at issue is very fairly stated. He admits, notwithstanding his previous assumptions and representa-

tions, that the reason that millenarians believe in Christ's future reign with his saints on the earth, is, that it is in their judgment clearly foreshown in the Apocalypse, not that certain Jewish Rabbis, many ages ago, held that their expected Messiah was to reign on the earth. He admits, also, that their belief that the Apocalypse foreshows such a reign, is not followed by any such rejection or distrust of the Apocalypse, as he maintains must result from it; but consists as perfectly with their faith in it as a divine revelation, as their belief does in any of the other events which it foreshows. Having thus in effect abandoned so large a share of the grounds he had before advanced to sustain his proposition, and admitted that if the question is to be settled, it must be settled by an appeal to the Apocalypse, not to creeds, to doctors, or to the church, how does he now attempt to show that that prophecy presents no revelation of a reign of Christ and his saints on the earth for a thousand years? By the pretence that the belief that it makes such a revelation, has its origin in a mistaken view of the plan of the prophecy. He says:

"Such is the language of those who maintain a millennium. We have spoken already of two causes of the millenarian error, and we are now led to mention a third. This is to be found in an incorrect view of the plan of the Apocalypse.

"The advocates of this doctrine have commonly supposed that the Apocalypse is, if we may so speak, a continuous prophetic history, flowing on in a regular chronological stream from the beginning to the end. This being their theory, they are necessarily led to regard the events of the twentieth chapter as subsequent to those of the nineteenth; and since the nineteenth terminates with the destruction of the beast and the false prophet, and with the great victory of Christ in the mystical conflict of Armageddon, they cannot conceive that the twentieth chapter refers to events of *earlier* date, or, indeed, to anything else than a period posterior to that great triumphant catastrophe.

"But this theory is, I am persuaded, very erroneous. The Apocalypse is not a consecutive prophecy. Rather it is to be regarded as a synoptical system of co-ordinate prophecies. And so it was regarded by the ancient expositors."—P. 41.

We are surprised that Dr. Wordsworth should have fallen into so extraordinary a misapprehension. In the first place,

millenarians do not universally entertain that view of the plan of the Apocalypse which he ascribes to them. If it was held by Mede, Newton, and others, two centuries ago, and is adopted by Elliot and some others of the present day, it is not entertained by Cuninghame, Bickersteth, Brooks, Birks, Bonar, and many other recent writers. In the next place, however, it is not peculiar to millenarians, but is even more common to those who reject Christ's personal reign on the earth; such as Vitringa, Lowman, Faber, and a crowd of others. In the third place, those millenarians who hold that the events foreshown in the Apocalypse were to take place generally in the order of the visions in which they are revealed, are not prompted by it, in any measure, to the construction which they put on the twentieth chapter. They regard that chapter as foreshowing Christ's reign with his saints on earth for a thousand years, because the symbols and language (v. 1-6) interpreted by their proper laws, constitute a revelation of such a reign. Their views of the nature of the events there foreshown is not influenced at all by their theory of the order in which those events are to take place. If, as he represents, that theory of the order of the events necessarily or naturally leads to the conviction, that a personal reign of Christ and his saints on the earth is revealed in the vision of the twentieth chapter (v. 4-8), why were not Vitringa, Mr. Faber, and a thousand others who have held it, led by it to regard such a millennium as foreshown in that vision? But finally, even on the supposition on which Dr. Wordsworth proceeds, that the events foreshown in the twentieth chapter precede those revealed in the nineteenth, it does not follow that the vision of the twentieth, v. 1-8, does not reveal a reign of Christ and his saints on the earth. The import of that vision depends on the symbols and language by which the events it foreshows are signified, not on the period when those events are to take place. If the passage actually reveals such a reign, it must be considered as foreshown and certain to take place, whether its period is supposed to precede or follow that of some other event. He is thus as unsuccessful in his attempt to expunge the prediction from the prophecy by this expedient, as by those he had employed for the purpose before.

But he is altogether mistaken in his assumption that the

visions (chap. xx. 1-10) present a mere recapitulation of what had been revealed in the preceding chapter. He asks, "What now is the subject of the twentieth chapter?" and answers:

"The seals being all opened, the trumpets having all sounded, the vials being all poured out, he *reascends* once more, and once for all, in order to declare what Christ had done for his church, even from his incarnation; how he had bound Satan; how he had preserved his faithful servants in every age; how he had done *his part*, and would do so unto the end, that all men should be saved; how he had offered heavenly glories to all that are true to him; how even out of the mouths of babes and sucklings he had ordained strength; and thus he showed that the failings and miseries of men, which had been described in such vivid colours in the preceding visions of this book, were due to themselves; and that all God's acts towards man were done in equity and love.

"The twentieth chapter, then, is the summing up of the whole revelation. Viewed in this light it is in perfect harmony with the whole. It is the moral epilogue of this sublime drama, and when so regarded, it gives no countenance to millenarian doctrines."—Pp. 42, 43.

It is not easy to see how Dr. Wordsworth could justify himself in resorting to such a representation to accomplish the objects at which he aims. To say nothing of his omission to allege anything from the passage to verify it—of his resting it on his mere asseveration—it must be apparent to any one who glances at the chapter that it contains no such revelation as he ascribes to it, nor anything from which any ingenuity can with the least show of reason deduce such a meaning. His version is a sheer fiction, as completely alien from the passage as any other he could have framed. What is there in the chapter that shows what Christ had done for his church even from his incarnation? Is there anything said of his ministry, his teachings, his miracles, his crucifixion, his resurrection, his commission of his disciples, his gift of the Spirit, his sanctification of his chosen people from age to age? What is there in it that is expressly designed to show how "he had done his part, and would do so unto the end, that all men might be saved?" Is there any enumeration of his great acts? Is there any statement of his offers of salvation to all who would accept it; and his

calls to all men to repent and come to him for life? What is there in it that shows "how he had offered heavenly glories to all that are true to him, and how even out of the mouths of babes and sucklings he had ordained strength?" Fancy itself may search the chapter in vain for anything that can be tortured into a semblance of such representations. That which was beheld by the prophet in the visions of the chapter was first, a strong angel descending from heaven, binding Satan with a chain and shutting him up in an abyss for a thousand years, that he should during that period deceive the nations no more. And in connexion with that vision it was announced that after the thousand years he is to be loosed again for a short season. Next he beheld thrones on which persons sat to whom judicial authority was given, and saw that those persons were the martyrs who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and whoever had not worshipped the beast nor its image; and it is announced in connexion with that, that they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years; that their restoration to life is the first resurrection; that all who share in that resurrection are freed for ever from the dominion and curse of sin, are priests of God and Christ, and are to reign with him a thousand years; but that the rest of the dead will not be raised to life till the thousand years are passed; that at the close of that period Satan shall be loosed, and again seduce the nations to revolt; that they were seen by the prophet advancing to battle, and that they were destroyed by fire from God out of heaven, and the devil cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. And finally he beheld the Judge seated on a great white throne, and saw the dead small and great stand before him, heard their final sentence, and witnessed its infliction; and these great spectacles, with the explanations that were given of them, are all that he saw and heard. What can be more utterly unlike these than the exhibitions and announcements which Dr. Wordsworth ascribes to the passage? It bespeaks a hopeless condition, truly, when such a misrepresentation is deemed the best expedient that can be devised to give a color of truth to his theory. It indicates an extraordinary force of prejudice, when a writer of Dr. Wordsworth's rank can persuade himself that such a treatment of the prophecy is compatible either with a just regard

to the laws of interpretation, or with the reverence that is due to the Word of God.

From these unsuccessful endeavors to get rid of the doctrine of a millennium, he proceeds to a direct examination of the symbols and language of the chapter, and alleges first, that the binding of Satan indicates nothing more than was accomplished by Christ during his ministry. He says of verses 1-4:—

“ This angel, it is confessed by all, is no other than Jesus Christ, the angel of God's presence—the angel of the covenant. He has the key of the bottomless pit. . . . He has a great chain in his hand, and with it he binds Satan. . . . Christ proved his power over Satan at the temptation. Then he vanquished him who had vanquished Adam and all his race. After the conflict, the devil departed from him, and behold angels came and ministered unto him. He then shed abroad the light of his glorious gospel on those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil; for God was with him. . . . And not only did he thus exercise dominion over Satan in his own person, but he gave it to others, his apostles and disciples. He gave them power and authority over all devils. He thus put the chain into their hands, and empowered them to bind Satan.”—Pp. 53, 54.

But first, he here treats the vision as a mere exhibition of what had already come to pass, instead of a revelation of what was future, which is to contradict its nature as a prophecy; and the representation (chap. iv. 1) that the things that were shown to John in the visions, were things that were to come to pass after he beheld the symbols by which they are represented.

Next, he is wholly mistaken in the supposition that the angel who bound Satan was Christ. It is expressly shown (chap. v.) that no created being was competent to take Christ's place in the visions, and perform the acts that belong to him as the Lamb, the lion of Judah, who redeemed us by his blood. Christ accordingly appears in person in all the visions in which it is foreshown that he is to interpose in accomplishing the great scheme of government which is revealed in the prophecy;—as in the destruction of the beast

and false prophet; in the presentation of the hundred and forty-four thousand on Mount Zion; in his reign in the new Jerusalem; and at the last resurrection and judgment of the dead. This consideration alone overturns Dr. W.'s construction. As the angel who bound Satan was not Christ, the binding cannot have been an act which Christ himself had exerted. But, thirdly, no binding of Satan, by which he was prevented from exerting his tempting influences, was accomplished by Christ during his ministry. There is no hint in the gospels that Christ chained and imprisoned that malignant agent in the abyss. So far from it, we are expressly told by the apostle that the devil goes about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, and are warned to guard against his wiles. But that he was not then bound, is certain from the facts of history. No greater proofs ever appeared that he was at liberty and exerting his power on a vast scale, than are presented by the seduction of the church to idolatry, the establishment over it of a head that usurps the throne and prerogatives of God, and its persecution of the true worshippers through a long succession of ages. Yet the coming of that man of sin is explicitly ascribed by the apostle to the inworking of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and deceivableness of unrighteousness.

That the binding was not accomplished during Christ's ministry, is apparent, moreover, from the consideration that the thousand years of Satan's imprisonment are the same as those of the saints' reign with Christ. But that period, instead of having passed, is still future, manifestly from the fact that those who are then to reign, are to comprise all who have been put to death by the wild beast for the testimony of Jesus, and whoever has not worshipped the beast nor its image. At the earliest, therefore, the thousand years cannot have begun a century or two ago, as within that period many martyrs have been put to death in France, Spain, and Italy, for the witness of Jesus. Nor can they have yet begun, for the beast is still making war on the saints, and there are persons at this moment who are suffering persecution because they refuse to worship it or its image. Nothing can more palpably contradict the prophecy than the opposite supposition. The beast still exists, is still persecuting, and is to continue to persecute, we are told, till its last hour.

The great war in which it is to perish, is to be a war on Christ's kingdom. As then all whom it puts to death and persecutes because they refuse to worship it, are to reign during the thousand years, their reign for that period plainly cannot commence till the beast has ceased to persecute and to exist, and is therefore still future.

But Dr. Wordsworth's conception of the restraint to which Satan is to be subjected, does not agree in any measure with the representation of the prophecy. He says:—

“And if Satan still has power in the world, as doubtless he has, this, let us remember, is due to *man*, and not to God. It is because *men sleep*, when God bids them to watch; therefore the enemy comes. But the devil is chained to all who do not loose him by their own sin. Put on the whole armor of God, and ye will be able to stand against the wiles, and to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. . . .

“It is *not* said that Christ rendered it *impossible* for the devil to deceive; but that he did *his* part in order that he should not deceive. It is true Christ does not destroy man's *free will*, and *force* him to be saved.”—Pp. 55, 56.

He thus confounds the watchfulness of persons against the wiles of the devil, or their protection from his fiery darts, with the binding and imprisonment of *Satan*, by which he is prevented from attempting to ensnare them, or hurling at them his darts. According to Dr. Wordsworth, Satan was not and is not in fact to be imprisoned or bound at all: he *was* and is still to continue at large, and as active as he pleases: all that is denoted by his being bound is, that he is to be obstructed and baffled in his endeavors to ensnare and destroy those whom God excites to watch against and resist him! which is neither a new restraint, nor greater than that to which he has always been subjected. But instead of this, the prophecy exhibits Satan as the subject of the binding and imprisonment, and represents it as a new and peculiar measure of the divine administration, as precluding him entirely from access to the nations, and as followed by the most momentous change in their condition and agency. He was bound with a great chain, cast into the bottomless pit, and shut up in it, that he should deceive the nations *no more*, till the thousand years shall be finished! No symbol

could exhibit more emphatically his absolute removal from the presence of the nations; nor any language indicate more strongly the total interception of his tempting agency on them. He is *no more* to deceive the nations. He is not only not to deceive them in any measure, nor in any instance, but he is not to be allowed to attempt it. He is not to be able to spread his wiles in their way, nor hurl against them his fiery shafts. The consequence is to be as is foreshown in other passages, that they are all to become righteous, God is to dwell with them, and be their God, and they are to be his people; they are to walk in the light of the New Jerusalem, the symbol of the risen saints, and to bring their power to it, and there is to be no more crying, nor sorrow, nor death, but the Lamb is to lead them to the fountains of living waters, and God is to wipe all tears from their eyes. This great measure is thus to be wholly unlike that which Dr. Wordsworth imagines the passage to foreshow, and is manifestly still future. The present condition of the nations, whether Pagan, Mahometan, or Christian, sunk as they are, with few exceptions, to extreme debasement and misery, and displaying in their wars, their oppressions, and their religion, the most awful alienation from God, presents the greatest possible contrast to that to which they are to be raised during the millennium, when they are to be exempted from Satan's tempting sway. Dr. Wordsworth has thus as totally misjudged of the meaning of this great vision, as he has of the period in which it is to receive its accomplishment. It is only by setting aside the symbols and language of the prophecy, and foisting a fiction in its place, that he gets rid of Satan's chain and prison, and leaves him to carry on his war on the nations without restraint.

This is confirmed finally by the consideration that in his view, the release of Satan at the end of the thousand years, is not to be a release from any limitations on his activity to which he had before been subjected, or involve the acquisition of a larger sphere, or greater freedom for the exertion of his power; but is only to be a decrease in the disposition and endeavors of the nations to resist him. It is they who are to be the subjects of the change which it denotes, not he; and the reason that they are then to be led by him to revolt, is to be, not that he assails them by more powerful

temptations than he before had; but only that they are then to be disposed to yield to such as they had before resisted. But this is directly the reverse of the prophecy. That represents that it is Satan that is to be released from restraints that had before prevented him from tempting the nations; not that it is the nations that are to be released from restraints by the Spirit, by conscience, by the word, and by Providence, by which they had before been withheld from yielding to his tempting agency. Instead therefore of establishing his view of the passage, he has disregarded both its symbols and its language, and framed for them a sense that presents to them the grossest contradiction. It remains then an unaltered and indisputable certainty that the vision reveals a total interception of Satan from access to the nations for the period denoted by a thousand years, during which, it is foreshown in the vision that follows, Christ and his saints are to reign over them, and they, as we learn from other passages, are to be universally obedient.

Dr. W. next endeavors to show that the revelation made in the next vision is not a revelation of a real resurrection and reign of the saints. He adduces as a proof of it, first, that those whom the prophet saw, who are said to live and reign with Christ the thousand years, are called *souls*. He says:

“Let us observe that these words are not spoken of the *bodies* of the saints, but of their souls. I saw *the souls* of them who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus. This must be carefully borne in mind, because the error of the millenarians is mainly due to a neglect of this distinction. They imagine a bodily resurrection, whereas St. John speaks of a spiritual one.”—P. 50.

But that does not prove or imply that the resurrection foreshown by the vision is not a resurrection of their bodies. They are called souls, very probably, for the very purpose of showing that the life and reign that are predicated of them were to take place after their martyrdom, and, therefore, after their resurrection and the reunion to them of their bodies. Had they been simply denominated martyrs, and such as did not worship the beast nor its image, that language might, perhaps, be alleged by Dr. Wordsworth and others as a

proof that the life and reign ascribed to them preceded their death. But that construction is now cut off, by the definition of them as persons who had already been beheaded, and had already refused to worship the beast and its image, and exhibition, thereby, of the life and reign to which the apostle saw them raised, as subsequent to that refusal and martyrdom. He alleges:

"It is not said that those souls lived *again*, but that they lived and reigned with Christ. It is clear, then, that what is here said, is spoken not of a corporeal, but of a *spiritual* resurrection."—P. 58.

But this is mistaken, manifestly, from the fact that the change which is predicated of them, and denominated "the first resurrection," took place after they had suffered death. It cannot have been a spiritual renovation, therefore, as they had entered on a spiritual life anterior to their death. None, moreover, who die in impenitence are renewed to righteousness after their entrance into the other world. The new life, then, on which they entered at the commencement of the thousand years, was not a new spiritual life, of which their souls only were the subjects, but was a new corporeal life, by a resurrection from the grave. And this is shown also by the use of the verb—they lived. The dead are exhibited in this passage as consisting of two great classes—the holy and blessed, to whom judicial authority was given, and who lived and reigned the thousand years; and the rest of the dead who lived not till the thousand years were finished. As then the life predicated of these last is indisputably a corporeal life by a resurrection; the life predicated of the former must also have been a corporeal life by a resurrection from the grave. And this is demonstrated by the declaration, that the entering of the martyrs and others who had died, on their new life of the thousand years, is the first resurrection. If their entering on that life was a mere spiritual renovation, it could not have been the first spiritual resurrection, inasmuch as they had been first renewed to a spiritual life while in the body, anterior to their corporeal death. The term resurrection, moreover, cannot be used here in a metaphorical sense. To be used metaphorically, it must be applied to some agent, or thing, that, from its nature, cannot

be the subject of a literal resurrection; but it is perfectly proper to the holy dead to whom it is here applied, to be raised to a corporeal life, and that is a change which they are in fact to undergo. He adds:

"It is not said that *Christ* reigns with his saints, but that *they* reign with him. He is in heaven, and will there remain till he comes to judge, when all true believers will be caught up to meet him in the air. Therefore, what is here said is spoken not of an *earthly* but *heavenly* resurrection."—P. 58.

But if the resurrection which the apostle beheld took place in heaven, in contradistinction from earth, it cannot have been a spiritual regeneration, inasmuch as the holy dead had been regenerated while in their natural bodies, anterior to their removal to the heavenly world.

Dr. Wordsworth, whether aware of it or not, has been thus far employed in defining what the spectacle was which the apostle beheld; and the symbols which John saw were unquestionably thrones, and the holy dead, raised to a corporeal life, reigning on them, with Christ. The question now is, what is it that is *represented* by these symbols?—What is it that they foreshow? The prophecy itself declares that it is the first resurrection, that is, that it is the corporeal resurrection of the holy dead, at the commencement of the thousand years, which is the first in contradistinction from the corporeal resurrection of the rest of the dead, which is not to take place till after the thousand years have passed. But according to the answer Dr. Wordsworth gives, it is of a wholly different nature, and those who are the subjects of it are of a directly opposite character. He asks,

"What now is the spiritual resurrection of the Christian? Our natural condition is one of death. By nature we are spiritual dead; but Christ, who is the Prince of life, hath quickened us who were dead in trespasses and sins. Therefore, our first or spiritual resurrection is our death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness. It is our engrafting into the new vine—our incorporation into the body of Christ. By one spirit we are all baptized into one body—the body of Christ, which is his church. Buried with him in baptism, we are raised with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead . . .

"Such, then, is the first resurrection. And why is it called the *first* resurrection? Because it precedes the resurrection of the body, and because it is the opposite of the second death, which is the casting of the soul and body into the lake of fire.

"The erroneous application of the present passage of the *Apocalypse* to a mere bodily resurrection, instead of to the spiritual regeneration which is effected by our incorporation into the mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and the consequent supposition, that the saints of Christ will be raised in *person*, in order to reign with Christ for a thousand years on earth, and that other men will not be raised till this period has expired—is a natural result of *low and inadequate notions of our baptismal privileges and obligations, and of the sacred duties and inestimable blessings of church membership and church unity; and wherever unworthy notions are entertained on these momentous points, there the doctrine of a millennium may be expected to prevail.*"—P. 59, 60.

It will be news, we suspect, to our antimillenarian readers, to hear from so high a quarter, that their rejection of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration—for it is that, we take it, that lurks under the terms "baptismal privileges," and "the blessings of church membership and unity"—exposes them to the imminent peril of believing Christ's pre-millennial advent, the resurrection of the saints at that epoch, and their reign with him on the earth during the thousand years. But the construction Dr. W. places on the vision is wholly erroneous. He makes the holy dead the symbols of the unholy living, and the resurrection of the holy dead the symbol of the regeneration of the unholy living. But that is against analogy. The dead are not proper representatives of the living; nor the holy of the unholy. It is in direct contradiction, moreover, of the declaration made in explanation of the meaning of the vision;—This is the first resurrection, that is, the symbol or prophetic representation of the first resurrection; which is immediately contrasted with the corporeal resurrection of the rest of the dead, which is the second, and is not to take place till after the thousand years are passed. As the symbol of the first resurrection was a literal resurrection of the holy dead, precisely as the symbol of the second or resurrection of the rest of the dead, was a literal resurrection; so that which is represented and fore-shown by the symbolic resurrection of the holy dead, must

be their literal corporeal resurrection; in the same manner as the symbolic resurrection of the rest of the dead represents and foreshows their literal corporeal resurrection. If Dr. W. makes the first denote a spiritual regeneration, he must for the same reason give the same construction to the second; and make it a revelation, therefore, that all the unholy are ultimately to be regenerated and saved.

His construction contradicts the prophecy in other relations also. The life which they who are represented by the holy dead, are to live, they are to live in the period that is symbolized by the thousand years; which, according to the usage of the symbolic prophecies, denote three hundred and sixty thousand years. Where is the corresponding period during which, on Dr. W.'s theory, those who are regenerated are to live in this world, and in the natural body? For this world is to be the scene of the life and reign that are foreshown by the symbol, as unquestionably as what he regards as the regeneration is. There is no hint that they are to be assigned to another world; and as they are to live in this world, they must, on his construction, be in the natural body. Is he then aware of any who have been baptized and invested by that rite with "the blessings of church-membership," who have lived three hundred and sixty thousand, or even one thousand years here, before their death? On his construction *indisputably* every one who has been regenerated since the vision was beheld by the apostle, should have continued in life to the present time. Not one should have been beheaded for the witness of Jesus. Not one should have suffered death in any form. They should have continued to live a natural, as well as a spiritual life. If that which is foreshown by the symbol is a spiritual regeneration in the natural life in the body; if the life which those who are regenerated live, is a life of church-membership in this world, and in the natural body—and if that life is to continue through the period denoted by the thousand years, which are to extend down to the time of the resurrection of the rest of the dead; what is clearer than that all who are the subjects of that regeneration and church-membership, must continue to live here as members of the visible church, and therefore in the natural body, till the time of the resurrection of the rest of the dead? Such

is the result to which his construction leads! Such is the issue of the extraordinary measure he employs to strike from the prophecy the revelation it makes of the resurrection of the holy dead, and reign with Christ on earth during the period denoted by the thousand years. Is it credible that he would have plunged into such an abyss of palpable and revolting errors, had he been able to accomplish his object by legitimate means? Can higher proof be needed that it is only by disregarding and violating the laws of symbols and language, that attempts are made to force an antimillenarian sense on this passage?

It is an equally fatal objection to his construction of the vision, that instead of the continued natural life of all the renewed, it also implies on the other hand that the binding of Satan, the reign of the saints, and the last resurrection, are already past. He states this objection in the following manner:

"The second objection to our interpretation is this. A thousand years, it is said, is a *definite* period; and if this period is not future, and if it *began* at Christ's incarnation, then it has expired; and the loosing of Satan has already taken place; and as his loosing was to be but for a little season, therefore, this too is past: and since the rest of the dead are not to live *until the thousand years are finished*, therefore, they are to live *when those years are past*, and so the second advent and the general resurrection and universal judgment ought now to have taken place."—P. 67.

This result he attempts to escape by denying that the thousand years denote a definite period.

"We affirm that the thousand years are not to be regarded as indicating a *fixed* period. Indeed the whole teaching of Scripture forbids such an interpretation. It is very certain that the future is uncertain. Prophecy is not an almanac. No one can calculate the world's eclipse. The great day *will come*, but no one can say *when* that coming will be.

"To interpret the thousand years so as to make them indicate a *fixed* period, is, we repeat, repugnant to the whole teaching of Scripture. It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. Watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is. The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the

night. Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.'

"Now if the thousand years in the Apocalypse were a *fixed* time, these sayings concerning the *suddenness* of Christ's second coming to judge the quick and the dead, would not be true. But they are the sayings of him who is the truth, and therefore they are true, as God himself is true. Hence we infer that the word *thousand* is here a general one; and by a thousand years in the text, the Holy Spirit does not limit a specific sum any more than when he says, 'Man cannot answer God one of a thousand.'"—P. 68.

Here is a singular assemblage of errors. He in the first place confounds a knowledge of the period which the thousand years denotes, with a knowledge of the time when it is to begin. But they have no necessary connexion with each other. To hold that the thousand years symbolize three hundred and sixty thousand, does not imply that the time is known when that period is to commence. To interpret the thousand years, therefore, as representing that period, is not to offer any contradiction to the teachings of the Scriptures respecting the uncertainty to us of the time, and the suddenness, and the unexpectedness of Christ's coming. As his advent is to precede, not follow, the millennial age, the fact that that age is to be of such a specific length, does not indicate that the moment when he is to come and introduce it is not to remain unknown to us.

Next, he overlooks the fact that the thousand years are used as a symbol of another and greater period, on the same principle that other symbols are used, like the horsemen of the seals, for example, as representatives of a number and succession of agents; and that as the symbol is a specific number, so also is that which it represents. It can no more be claimed that the thousand years stand for an indefinite period, than it can that the ram, the goat, and the ten-horned beast of Daniel's visions represent an indefinite series of rulers of the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman empires. So far from it, the very object of the symbols of time which are employed as the measure of the great agencies to which they are applied, is to show that they are not interminable nor indefinite, but have a specific limitation, and to indicate what that period is; and they have proved in their practical

effect to be among the most important of the revelations in the prophecies; for they have contributed greatly in every age to support the faith and hope of God's people in the persecutions they have suffered from the apostate powers. Had there been no such indications of the period during which the wild beast is to continue its cruel sway, the woman dwell in the wilderness, and the witnesses prophecy in sackcloth, there would be no certainty but that the domination of the apostate powers is still to continue through a long series of ages. The only question that needs to be debated in regard to them, respects the principle on which the periods that are employed as symbols are used. It is known, then, first, that whatever the symbol term be, whether a time, a year, a month, or a day, the real representative measure that is employed is a day. Thus a time, times, and half a time, that is three years and a half and forty-two months, are used as equivalent to twelve hundred and sixty days, the number they contain; as they are employed as symbols of the same period. A year then denotes a period as much longer than is symbolized by a day, as it is itself greater than a day; that is, it represents the same period as would be symbolized by three hundred and sixty days; and a thousand years accordingly symbolizes the same as would be represented by three hundred and sixty thousand days. What, then, is the period of which a day is used as a symbol? The answer is—A year. This is apparent, first, from the consideration that a year is the only period to which a day presents an analogy. A day is the space in which the earth turns round on its axis, and assumes exactly the same position in respect to the sun it was in before; and a year is the space during which it wheels round the sun, and in that respect reaches again exactly the same position it was in before. The smaller revolution presents an exact analogy, therefore, to the larger one, and is a natural and proper representative of it. Next: It is interpreted as used in that relation in the first prophecy in which it is used as a symbol, Ezekiel iv. 6. And, finally, that it is used on that principle, is demonstrated by the long period that has passed since the wild beast, the woman in the wilderness, the witnesses of the Apocalypse, and the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast, commenced the agencies

of which three years and a half, forty-two months, and twelve hundred and sixty days are used as the symbolic measure. Those agencies have undoubtedly already continued through very nearly twelve hundred and sixty years. The thousand years, then, symbolized unquestionably three hundred and sixty thousand; a period as fixed and specific as the symbol itself is.

Such is the issue of his attempts to set aside this great prophecy. Notwithstanding all his efforts to fasten on it a foreign and preposterous meaning, it remains a clear and unpervertible revelation that the holy dead are to be raised from their graves at the commencement of the thousand years, and are then to be constituted priests unto God and to Christ, and to reign with him on the earth through the vast circuit of ages denoted by that period.

Having thus, in his judgment, shown that there is to be no binding of Satan, no resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the thousand years, no reign by them with Christ on the earth during that period, nor any definite period denoted by that symbol, he then returns to the fourth chapter of the prophecy, and gives his views of the other principal visions. Some of these exemplify in a very striking manner the wild and contradictory constructions into which writers run, who, instead of making themselves acquainted with the laws of symbolization, take the fancies and conjectures of the allegorizers and spiritualists of the third and following centuries as their guide. We have an instance in the import he ascribes to the living creatures. He asks:—

“What now is to be said of the four living creatures, with figures like the cherubim, winged and full of eyes, upon which God himself is enthroned ?

“In them the ancient church beheld a figure of the four gospels. They had been represented under this image by the prophet Ezekiel in his vision at the river of Chebar, and now they are viewed again by St. John in Patmos. This interpretation, which recognises the four gospels in the four living creatures of heaven, dates from the age and school of St. John himself. It is found in the writings of St. Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and is sanctioned by the almost unanimous authority of the greatest teachers of the eastern and western churches.

“As the four living creatures represent the four gospels, so we

are led by analogy to anticipate that the four-and-twenty elders represent the old dispensation, and it is a remarkable fact of which we are reminded by Christian antiquity that the Old Testament Scriptures, according to one of the most commonly received modes of Jewish reckoning, by which the twelve minor prophets are reckoned as one book, and the two books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, as one each, and some other similar arrangements are made, consist on the whole of four-and-twenty books."—Pp. 102, 103.

Nothing, it seems to us, but a blind adherence to ancient writers, without inquiring what the principle is on which symbols are used, would lead any one to accept such a construction, which has not a single consideration drawn from the nature of the symbol to support it, as authentic. Had Dr. Wordsworth looked into the prophecies instead of the fathers and commentators of the dark ages, to learn what the relation is in which living symbols are employed, he would have seen that in every interpretation that is given of them, they are exhibited as representing living and intelligent agents, and of our race, when they are not of an angelic order. And that is according to analogy. There is no resemblance between an intelligent agent and an unconscious work like a book. Living and active agents like the living creatures, have no adaptation to symbolize such an involuntary existence, that, instead of acting, can only be used as an instrument. When, accordingly, the Scriptures are to be symbolized, they are represented by a volume as in the hands of the angel, chap. x.; and when a fixed purpose representing the future is to be revealed, it is represented by a written roll, or volume, as the sealed book, chap. v.

But apart from the consideration that his construction is arbitrary and against analogy, there is no such correspondence as he seems to imagine, between the number of the representatives, and the sacred books. If the living creatures are symbols of any part of the New Testament, why was not their number equal to the twenty-seven different compositions of which it consists? Are the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse to be considered as of less authority and moment than the gospels? It would be far more natural, if they are to be taken as symbols of the New Testament, to regard them as representing the whole in the

four great parts of which they consist—the gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation.

The supposition that the Old Testament is symbolized by the twenty-four elders, is equally inconsistent with their number, which is greater by fifteen. The twelve minor prophets were no more reckoned as one, than the Pentateuch was, or the whole of the prophets.

But he is mistaken also in the representation that the ancient church generally regarded the living creatures as representing the gospels. Origen interprets the word cherub as denoting plenitude of knowledge; and says, whoever is perfected in knowledge, becomes a cherub, and is subjected to, or guided by God. He then explains the four faces as representing the supercelestial, the celestial, the terrestrial, and the infernal; or the whole circle of existences that are under God's government, as the cherubim were under his throne: and, finally, he interprets the man, the lion, the calf, and the eagle, as symbolizing the four constituents of the mind, reason, anger, desire, and conscience. (Homily, in Ezek.) This last construction is given also by Gregory Nazianzen. Theodoret represents the lion as symbolizing empire, or rule; the calf as signifying the priesthood; the eagle prophecy; and these with man who is invested with them, as indicating by their station beneath the throne, that man's whole nature is subject to the sway of the creator and ruler of all, who endowed him with his various gifts. Even Jerome, whom Dr. Wordsworth quotes as interpreting them as symbols of the gospels, does not limit them to that office, but exhibits them as representing the several characteristics of man which he regarded as answering to those of the four creatures whose faces they bore—the lion, the controlling power, or conscience; man, reason; the calf, labor; the eagle, contemplation. Cherubim autem interpretatur scientiæ plenitudo. Significat autem persona leonis regalem, hoc est, regnare passionibus; persona hominis rationabilem; persona vituli in opere; persona aquilæ in contemplatione, hoc est, in theoria, quæ nos exaltat in virtutibus. Com. in Psal. lxvii. Even Haymo, whom Dr. Wordsworth also quotes, interpreted them as denoting Christ and the saints, as well as the gospels. Nulli dubium quin hæc animalia Dominum Jesum Christum significant, et omnes sanctos, præcipueque

quatuor evangelia. Bernard regarded them as an order of angels; and some among the Protestants have supposed them to denote the ministers of the church. Flacius says, it has been much disputed what they signify; but the most eligible judgment seems to be, that they denote the pious teachers throughout the four quarters of the world, praising Christ and the Father. Valde autem disputatur quid ista animalia significant, dum alii alias notiones eis attribuunt, sicut in Ezekiele. Sane illa omnium commodissima interpretatio esse videtur, quod significant pios doctores per quatuor orbis terrarum plagas, Christum et Patrem cælestem celebrantes. Illos oportet esse oculatissimos, et ceu Argos quosdam, dum illos tum oves singulas earumque morbos cognoscere et curare oportet, tum voluntatem Domini diligentissime observare et Scripturas scrutari, tum lupos ac fures, seu seductores eorumque errores ac corruptelas, et omnino suborientes abusos, atque adeo etiam ipsas Sathanæ machinationes perspicere, easque prævertere et ubique omnibus suborientibus malis festinanter occurrere. Glos. super Apoc. c. iv. p. 1327. We might adduce several other constructions, but these are sufficient to show on how slight a ground Dr. W.'s statement rests that "the ancient church saw in the living creatures a figure of the four gospels," and how mistaken his representation is that the writers of the early and middle ages can safely be taken as guides in the interpretation of the prophecy.

But the living creatures are not the only symbols which Dr. W. interprets as representing the Scriptures. He assigns the same office to the two olive trees, the four angels that held the winds, the four that were bound at the Euphrates, and the two witnesses.

"The Church, as she looked on the two golden candlesticks fed by the two olive trees, saw herself illumined by the two Testaments. The Scriptures of the two Testaments are her olive trees planted in the house of the Lord, ever flourishing with fresh leaves for the healing of the nations, ever bearing the emblems of peace, ever pouring forth the oil of gladness, and ministering the food of light."—P. 111.

But the olive trees are interpreted by the angel (Zech. iv. 11–14) as symbolizing the anointed ones; that is, the minis-

ters who stand before the Lord of the earth. They are exhibited as agents, moreover, distilling oil into the bowls of the candlesticks, and must, therefore, by the law of symbols, represent agents. Of the four angels who held the winds, and the four who were bound at the Euphrates, he says:—

“Loose the four angels. This carries us back to the sixth seal, where we have already seen four angels standing at the four corners of the earth, having power to hurt the earth, the sea, and the trees, holding the four winds that they may not blow upon the earth. And an angel cries to them: ‘Hurt not the earth, nor the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of God on their foreheads!’ And they are restrained till the sealing of the saints is complete.

“*These four angels* are now described as *bound*, bound at the great river Euphrates. The Euphrates is the river of Babylon; and Babylon in the Apocalypse is *always* used in a figurative sense; it designates the great city.

“These four angels then are *bound* as captives in the great city; and yet, in another sense, they are not *bound*, for they are said to stand at the four corners of the earth. How is this to be explained?

“*Naturally* this is impossible; and these physical incompatibilities, which are of frequent occurrence in the Apocalypse, are the very things which are designed to show the need of spiritual interpretations.

“To be brief, I believe that as the four living creatures under the heavenly throne represent the fourfold gospel in its *glorified condition*, *adoring God in heaven*, so the four angels represent the gospel diffused to the four winds of heaven, preached in the four quarters of the world. And this gospel is as free as air; as St. Paul says, the gospel is not bound.

“And yet in a certain sense, the gospel has been bound, bound at the great river Euphrates; bound in the great city—the mystical Babylon—the church of Rome; for that great city has put fetters upon it; it has chained the Word of God.”—Pp. 169, 170.

A shot wider of the mark we do not recollect to have seen. In the first place, he offers nothing but his belief to justify his construction. There is nothing in the nature or office of these angels to indicate that they represent the gospels, any more than there is that the seven angels, who bore the trumpets, or any others that appeared in the visions, symbolize that part of the sacred canon. If he founds his interpretation on the number four, why does he not take the four

horsemen of the seals, the four horns of the altar, and the four sides of the New Jerusalem, as representing them also? It were not more arbitrary and absurd. Next, as the angels were living agents, they cannot represent involuntary and inanimate things like the gospels, which are only means of influence when they are taken and used as instruments by intelligent agents. If angels can represent the gospels, why is it that when the communication of the gospel to all nations was to be symbolized, a single angel was exhibited flying "through mid-heaven, *having the everlasting gospel* to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying, with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters?" The gospel is there treated as differing as widely from the angel who bore it, as the message itself does which he proclaimed. On Dr. Wordsworth's construction, the sealing angel who came from the sun-rising, and addressed the four angels that held the winds, should represent a fifth gospel, and Dr. W. should have shown that such a writing has existed. But his construction is equally at war with every part of the vision. If the four angels who had control of the winds, are symbols of the gospels, what can be meant by the command to them by the angel from the sun-rising, not to exert their power in raising the tempest, till the servants of God could be sealed? Is a suppression of the gospels, or an intermission of their influence, necessary, in order to the sealing of the servants of God? Could Dr. W. have hit upon an interpretation involving a more unwarrantable supposition? The tempests, which the four angels are finally to excite, are to sweep the earth and sea with devastation. Are the gospels to be the causes of the political conflicts and revolutions, symbolized by those tempests, that are to strew the earth with ruin? Can a grosser contradiction to the prophecy be imagined?

The last great conflicts of the nations with each other symbolized under the vials, are exhibited as occasioned by political causes. The overthrow of Babylon is represented as the work of the multitude prompted to vengeance by her usurpations, her tyranny, and her wickedness; and the last great gathering of the anti-christian powers against the king-

dom of Christ, is to be excited, it is foreshown, not by the gospels, but by the unclean spirits from the mouth of the dragon, wild beast, and false prophet! Into what more unfortunate error could Dr. W. have fallen, than thus to transfer to the gospels the office of those anti-christian and malignant agents?

It is equally solecistical to interpret the four angels bound at the Euphrates as symbols of the gospels bound by the powers denoted by great Babylon. The gospels were not so much bound or imprisoned by the Catholic church, as they were perverted and superseded by a false system. But if it was the design of the vision to symbolize that procedure, why was the representation confined to the four gospels? Why was it not extended to the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, on the perversion of which a larger share of the Catholic system is founded, than on the misrepresentation of the gospels. The effect of the loosing of the four angels was the irruption of two myriads of myriads of monster horsemen into the empire, and the slaughter of one third of the inhabitants, because of their idolatry. Dr. W. regards those horsemen as angels. They were not, however. Angels are exhibited as having *wings*, and moving by them through the air. It were contrary to their nature, and incongruous, to exhibit a spiritual being as borne by a horse. As the horsemen were mounted on steeds, and clad in material armor, it is manifest that they were corporeal beings, and, therefore, like all the other monster symbols of the prophecy, represent men and warriors of a savage and cruel nature; and the avenging and slaughtering hosts whom they foreshow, were undoubtedly the Turks of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and the angels denote their commanders, as is seen from the fact that they were to direct the slaughter which they were to effect. What connexion then had the irruption of those hosts with the loosing of the gospels by the Catholic hierarchy? The release of the gospels at the Reformation did not take place till two hundred years after the Turks entered and conquered a large part of the eastern empire; nor until upwards of sixty years after that empire itself fell, at the fall of the capital. But the gospels were not even at the Reformation set at liberty in the mystical Babylon; neither have they been at any subsequent

period; nor are they to be. That great city is to continue and perish an apostate as she now is. What extraordinary errors, to confound the Mahometan leaders of the Turkish armies with the gospels; and to exhibit mystical Babylon as releasing the gospels from imprisonment and constraint, and giving them to the world as common and free as the air!

His interpretation of the two witnesses, as denoting the two Testaments, the law and the gospel, if less repulsive, is equally mistaken. The witnesses are living men, and represent living men, not inanimate, unconscious volumes, to which they bear no analogy. The relation of the witnesses to the gospels is their relation to the testimony which they utter; for the truths of the gospels, or rather of the Scriptures, are the truths to which they testify. To suppose them to be symbols of the Scriptures, is, therefore, to confound them with that which they teach. But what can be meant on Dr. W.'s construction by the death of the witnesses, the refusal of the people to bury them, the inspection of them by the nations, and their resurrection? Are the gospels to be annihilated or divested of their spirit or meaning, and made like a dead body? Can they be conceived as existing except as what they now are? But what can be meant by their being withheld from burial, and placed in the broad place of the great city, where they of the nations, and people, and languages go to gaze on them? Would not that imply that they are to be placed where whoever wishes may read and study them? What, moreover, is signified by their resurrection and assumption to heaven? Are they to be removed from the earth, and the nations left without any authentic record of the birth, ministry, teachings, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ? In what a mesh of incongruities and contradictions Dr. W.'s construction entangles him!*

* Dr. W. transcends himself in weakness and extravagance, in the constructions he places on some of these symbols. He says of the church of Rome:

"With the bitterest sorrow we say it, but it must be said, she has waged war against the two witnesses. She has placed her own traditions on a par with them. She has made them her slaves. She has added her human codicils as of equal value to the divine Testaments. She has spoken contemptuously of them. She has stifled their voice. She has refused to let them speak in their own language. She has forbidden the nations to hear them in

We have pointed out these extraordinary errors thus at length, for the purpose of showing the folly and presumption of an attempt to interpret the prophecy without any inquiry into the relation in which symbols are used, and the nature of the laws by which their explanation is to be obtained. It would be taken to indicate extreme thoughtlessness and weakness to undertake to translate a foreign language without any knowledge of its peculiar structure—without any investigation of its grammatical laws—without being able even to distinguish its nouns from its verbs, or its adjectives from its prepositions. Not a few of those, however, who undertake the interpretation of the Apocalypse, seem to think a total ignorance of the office and laws of symbols no disqualification for the work. They never advert to the question, whether their import depends on their nature; whether they are used in some natural and intelligible relation; and whether the prophecies themselves furnish the key by which their meaning is to be ascertained. A wild fancy, groundless hypotheses, or the absurd conjectures and capricious

vernacular tongues. She has not allowed their *bodies* to be put into *monuments*. The original word of the Apocalypse here is not *ταφες*, but *μνημα*, and is to be rendered, not graves, but a *monument*: that is, she has labored that the sacred body of the two witnesses may not be committed to the immortal *monuments of editions, vernacular translations, and expositions*; and so the words of the witnesses be graven on the memory of man, and on the heart of the world. And wonderful it is that she has not allowed their bodies to be put into a *single* monument; not a single *edition* of the original Scriptures of the Two Testaments has ever been printed at Rome—that *great city* which calls herself the mother and mistress of churches."—Pp. 193, 194.

The term *μνημα* denotes a sepulchral monument, or tomb, and was a place of interment, as is seen from the people's not allowing the dead bodies of the witnesses to be placed in it. That which was refused to their bodies, therefore, was a burial. If, then, it is the Scriptures that are represented by the slain witnesses, is it any discredit to the church of Rome that she refused to allow them to be interred—that she preserved them, where they were accessible, at least, to her priests, and to many of her members! But Dr. W. falls into a still worse blunder in his application of the symbol. To print an edition of the Scriptures, surely, is not to consign them to the seclusion and oblivion of the sepulchre. It is to give them a more general presence, and make them accessible and known to greater numbers. Nor is it to erect a monument or memorial of them.—That were to make them their own memorial, which is absurd. An edition of the Bible may be a monument of the learning and care of the editor. It cannot be a monument or memorial of the Bible itself.

dicta of fathers and doctors, who wrote in equal thoughtlessness and ignorance of the laws of symbolization, are taken as guides, instead of the revealing Spirit; and the result is a perpetual reproduction and multiplication of crude and monstrous perversions of the prophecy, like those on which we have animadverted of Dr. Wordsworth. Until this most unscholarly and presumptuous course is abandoned, what hope can there be that the Apocalypse will be generally understood?

We have done little else in this notice than point out errors. It would be unjust, however, to Dr. W. to leave our readers under the impression that his work presents no correct and useful views. The parts we have noticed are much the most exceptionable. He is far from erring always. He presents very just constructions of several of the symbols that are almost universally misinterpreted by the popular writers; and he devotes several of his lectures to the proof that the Catholic church is the power denoted by the great city and the woman Babylon, and though not without mistakes, gives a very striking array of the correspondences with those symbols that are presented by the papacy.

ART. IV.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE
FIGURES OF ISAIAH, CHAPTER XXIII.

“THE sentence of Tyre.” This prophecy of the overthrow of Tyre was written, probably, near one hundred and fifty years before her destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, when she was the great commercial city of the world, depending for her power and wealth, not on the plunder of other cities by war, or on tribute exacted from conquered nations, but on her own enterprise and energy in the arts of peace; and when, from her large population, the advantages of her position, and the strength of her fortifications, she was apparently able to defend herself from every foe that might venture to assail her. These peculiarities of her condition give an extraordinary force to the mode in which her desolation is announced. No details are given of the siege; no picture

is drawn of the courage and energy with which her people resisted the conqueror; their rapid waste from slaughter, famine, and pestilence; and the horrors of the final struggle, when the enemy passed the ramparts, and drove them to the sea. It was after the conquest was achieved and she had become a waste that the prophet speaks, and his first utterances are calls to the mariners and merchants of other ports, who were accustomed to frequent her, to lament her fall.

1. Apostrophe. "Howl, ye ships of Tarshish; for it is laid waste; there is no house, no entrance. From the land of Chittim it is revealed to them," v. 1.

2. Metonymy of ships for the persons who were on board of them. Tarshish was Tartessus, the capital of a Tyrian colony in Spain, with which Tyre carried on a large commerce. Chittim was a city of Cyprus, or that island itself, near which the ships from Tarshish passed on their way to Tyre. These ships were not improbably a fleet, conveying fresh troops, provisions, and implements of war for the relief of Tyre, and designed, perhaps, on their return, to transport such of the population as could be spared and their wealth to the distant colony, to place them beyond the grasp of the enemy, should the city finally fall. A fleet on such a voyage would naturally touch at Cyprus for information respecting the siege of Tyre, and the likelihood of their being able to enter her port, and yield her the relief they desired. The language indicates that boats or vessels put off from the isle, before they had communicated with the shore, and announced to them the catastrophe of the city. "From the land of Chittim," by messengers, "it was revealed to them" that Tyre was laid waste; not a house remained standing; no harbor even was left for the protection of a vessel. The port itself was obstructed by the embankments extended into it by the besiegers, and the demolition of the ramparts, so that no channel for the entrance of ships or place of anchorage was left.

3. Apostrophe to the inhabitants of the cities on the Mediterranean that had been accustomed to trade with Tyre. "Be silent"—with astonishment—"ye inhabitants of the coast," v. 2. They were to be struck with surprise and consternation at the catastrophe of the city, and the disasters the loss of her commerce was to bring to themselves.

The prophet next indicates some of the principal people who had shared in her commerce by sea. "The merchants of Sidon crossing the sea frequented thee"—Tyre; "and on the great waters" of the Mediterranean, "the seed of the Nile, the harvest of the river, was her revenue: and she was the mart of the nations," v. 3. The Sidonians, whose capital was on the same coast, and who were a maritime people, made it a principal business of their voyages to carry merchandise to and from Tyre. The grain of Egypt was received by her as revenue or profits on her commerce with that country; and she was the mart where all nations found a market for the products of their labor and skill. Those that traded in her fairs are more fully enumerated by Ezekiel, chap. xxvii.

4. Apostrophe. "Be ashamed, O Sidon," v. 4. Sidon, situated about twenty miles north of Tyre, and belonging to the same nation, was the parent of that city, v. 12.

5. Metonymy of the place for its population. The reason that the inhabitants of Sidon were to be ashamed, or confounded at the destruction of her daughter Tyre, is next given by the sea that had spread over the ruins of the fallen city.

6. Personification of the sea over the site of the demolished city. "For the sea speaks—the fortified place of the sea—saying, I have not travelled, nor have I borne; I have not reared young men, nor have I brought up virgins," v. 4. No other figure could have indicated with so awful an emphasis that there were no longer any on the site of Tyre, once, as a colony, the pride of the Sidonians, who could refer to them as their ancestors, or whom the Sidonians could claim with parental exultation as their descendants. Instead of boasting of Tyre as her offspring, and exulting in the glory which that city reflected back on herself, Sidon was now to be ashamed and confounded that a conqueror had swept that pride and joy for ever from her heart.

7. Comparison. "As though the tidings were of Egypt, they will be pained at the tidings of Tyre," v. 5. The news of her destruction was to strike the Sidonians with consternation and grief, as great as though a similar voice had come from the sea spread over Egypt, indicating that there was

no longer a people there towards whom they sustained any commercial or political relations.

8, 9. Apostrophes. "Pass over to Tarshish. Howl, ye inhabitants of the coast. Is this your city whose antiquity is of ancient days?" v. 7. The population of Tyre are here addressed, and called, as they departed to Tarshish, to wail over the wretched fate of their city. The command to pass over to Tarshish was a prediction; and was fulfilled by the migration of a considerable portion of the inhabitants when the advance of the besiegers made it apparent that the city must soon fall into their hands. Jerome relates, in his comment on the passage, that he had read in Assyrian histories that when the Tyrians saw there was no hope of escape, they embarked on board their ships and fled to Carthage and the islands of the Ionian and Egean seas; and in his exposition of Ezekiel xxix., that they carried with them their gold, silver, and other valuable property.

10. Metonymy of the city for her people considered as an individual. "Her feet shall carry her afar off to sojourn," v. 7. This indicates that they were not to find a home in the cities at which they were to land, but were still to travel a distance ere they reached places of rest. It is foreshown also, v. 12, that they were not to obtain a peaceful residence at Cyprus, at which they would naturally first touch on their voyage.

The prophet now asks who it is that designs to bring on the city the ruin he has foreshown. "Who hath purposed this against Tyre, the crowning"—that is the crown-giving city—"whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honorable of the earth?" And he answers: "Jehovah of hosts hath purposed it to pollute the excellence of beauty, to degrade all the honorable of the earth." The reason of his thus defacing her is stated more fully by Ezekiel. It was because of her pride and ambition. "The word of the Lord came unto me saying: Son of man, because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem; Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people, she is turned unto me: I shall be replenished now she is laid waste. Therefore saith the Lord God: Behold I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up. And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus,

and break down her towers; I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea; for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God: and it shall become a spoil to the nations."—Chap. xxvi. 1-5. "The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying: Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus: Thus saith the Lord God, because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said I am a God; I sit in the seat of God; in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thy heart as the heart of God. Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee. With thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures; by thy great wisdom and by thy traffic thou hast increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches. Therefore saith the Lord God, because thou hast set thy heart as the heart of God, behold therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations; and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness. They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas."—Chap. xxviii. 1-8. In thus tarnishing her glory by converting her site into a waste, and divesting her merchant princes of their commerce, wealth, and power, and driving them into exile, he showed the vanity, not only of the Tyrian, but of all earthly glory, and taught the rich and powerful, wherever they were, the frailness of the tenure by which they held their treasures and honors.

The prophet next shows that the Tyrians were not to be able, after the fall of the city, to retain their sway over any of the towns and territories in other places that had before been subject to them.

11. Apostrophe. "Pass through thy land like a river, O daughter of Tarshish," v. 10. This is usually supposed to refer to the territory in Phenicia, over which Tyre had held dominion. The land, however, over which her daughter of Tarshish was to pass, was undoubtedly her own territory in Spain, which had before been under the jurisdiction of Tyre, but was now to be ruled independently by the colonists.

12. Elliptical metaphor in denominating the people of Tarshish the daughter of that city.

13. Hypocatastasis in the use of girdle, to denote rule or oppression. "There is no longer any girdle," v. 10. That is, the Tyrians have no longer any control over your territory. You may pass through without obstruction, as the Nile, in the time of flood, spreads over the lands of Egypt that lie along its banks. This is corroborated by the prediction that follows, that all the fortresses of Tyre, wherever they were, were to be destroyed, and her triumph at every point cease.

14, 15, 16. Hypocatastases. "He stretched out his hand over the sea; he shook the kingdoms; Jehovah commanded concerning Canaan, to destroy her strongholds," v. 11. Jehovah's stretching out his hand over the sea is put for the acts of his providence by which the revolutions in the colonies took place that resulted from the fall of Tyre. That the colonies were the scene of the act which the figure denotes, is seen from the extension of the divine hand from Tyre over the sea to accomplish it. His shaking the kingdoms is put for his causing an agitation of the people inhabiting them, by which the power before exercised by the parent city was assumed by themselves; and his commanding to destroy the strongholds held by Canaan, is used to signify that he caused them to be destroyed. Tyre had many colonies at the west, on the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean, which now passed from her sway.

17. Apostrophe. "Thou shalt no more triumph, O, thou deflowered virgin, daughter of Sidon. Arise; pass over to Chittim; thou also there shalt have no rest," v. 12. Bereft of their power and glory, like a woman who had been dishonored, they would no more exult and triumph over their inferiors as they had once done. After reaching Cyprus and other and remoter colonies once subject to them, they were not to find repose, but instead of commanding, as they had been accustomed, were themselves to be subject to the will of others.

18, 19. Elliptical metaphors in denominating the people of Tyre, a virgin and a daughter.

The prophet now designates the nation by whom the overthrow of Tyre was to be accomplished.

20. Apostrophe. "Behold the land of the Chaldeans. This people was not. Assyria founded it for the inhabitants of the wilderness. They erect the watch towers; they rouse or alarm her palaces; they make her a ruin," v. 13. The destruction of Tyre by the Babylonians is predicted also by Ezekiel; chap. xxvi. 7-14.

21, 22. Metonymies in the use of Assyria for the Assyrians, and palaces for those who occupied them.

23. Metaphor in the use of founded, for constituted. The Assyrians established the Chaldeans as a colony in Babylonia. Their recent origin seems to be mentioned to show that the destruction of the city was to be the work of a people from whom the Tyrians, at the time of the prediction, apprehended no danger.

24. Apostrophe. "Howl, ye ships of Tarshish, for your stronghold is laid waste," v. 14. The prediction thus closes, as it began, with a summons to a public wail at the destruction of their city.

25. Metonymy of ships, for those who navigated and sailed in them.

This prophecy was fulfilled by Nebuchadnezzar, who, after a siege of thirteen years, during which, in extending embankments out to the isle, in order to get access to the walls, much of the port was filled up, captured the city, and reduced it to ruin.

The prophet next predicts that, after a period, the Tyrians should again return, rebuild their city, and renew their commerce.

26. Comparison. "And it shall come to pass in that day that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years; according to the days of one king. At the end of seventy years, there shall be to Tyre as it were the song of a harlot," v. 18.

By the days of one king, or dynasty, are doubtless meant the days, or duration of the Babylonian sway. It was subsequently predicted by Jeremiah that at the end of seventy years the nations conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, and especially those of Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and the coasts and isles of the west, should be released from the Babylonian rule. "Behold, I will send and will take all the families of the North, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring

them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against *all these nations round about*, and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations . . . And these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass when seventy years are accomplished, I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity." Jeremiah xxv. 9-24.

At the end of that period, when Babylon was to be conquered by the Persians, the Tyrians were to begin to resume their ancient pursuits, and were to employ arts to recall the attention and favor of those with whom they once carried on commerce, like those which a profligate woman uses to regain the notice of a paramour, by whom she has been forgotten.

27. Apostrophe. "Take a harp, go about the city, O harlot," v. 16.

28. Metaphor in denominating the population of the new city, a harlot.

29. Hypocatastasis, in the use of one set of acts as substitutes for another. "Take a harp; go about the city, O harlot that hast been forgotten. Play skilfully; sing much, that thou mayest be remembered," v. 16. Those arts to which women of that character were addicted, are thus used to represent the analogous arts which the Tyrians were to use to recover the patronage of the nations with which they had anciently carried on a lucrative commerce.

30, 31, 32. Hypocatastases. "And it shall come to pass at the end of seventy years, Jehovah shall visit Tyre, and she shall return to her gain, and she shall play the harlot with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth," v. 17. Jehovah's visiting Tyre is put for his favoring her by his providence; her returning to her gain is used to denote her resuming her commercial pursuits; and her playing the harlot, to represent the arts she was to employ to recover the favor and business she had formerly enjoyed when she was the mart of the nations. "But her merchandise and her gain shall be consecrated to Jehovah. It shall not be treasured up, and it shall not be hoarded. For her merchandise shall be for them who dwell before Jehovah; for food sufficient and for durable clothing," v. 18. This

prophecy of the re-establishment of Tyre was also verified. On the fall of Babylon, which took place after the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar had reigned seventy years, the nations of Palestine and the west appear to have recovered in a measure their liberty. The Phenicians had risen to such strength at the time of Xerxes's expedition against Greece, as to furnish a considerable fleet for his service; and Tyre had fully recovered her ancient power and glory, and long enjoyed a prosperous career, when, on Alexander's march to the east, she was again conquered and laid waste.

ART. V.—THE FULNESS OF THE TIMES.

BY THE REV. JOHN FORSYTH, JR., D.D.

IN a former article we endeavored to show that during the long period that elapsed between the fall and the advent, human nature was subjected to a series of trials, designed on the one hand to develop its various powers, and on the other to prove that by no merely spontaneous exercise of them, could man rescue himself from the thralldom of sin. We intimated that there may be some allusion to this trial of what is in man, in that declaration of St. Paul, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son."

The same apostle, in his epistle to the Ephesians, though treating of a very different subject, has nearly the same form of words,—*"That in the dispensation of the fulness of the times, he might gather together in one all things, in Christ."* Without entering into anything like a critical examination of this passage, we would observe that even those expositors who regard the "dispensation" here spoken of as the one under which we live, for the most part admit that the period on which the apostle's eye was fixed, when he penned these words, is one in the future. The meaning of the verse is, on the whole, very well brought out by Doddridge, who thus paraphrases it: *"That in the economy of the fulness of the times, or when that time was fully come which he in his wise appointment and distribution of things had judged most suitable and eligible, he might re-unite under one head all*

things in Christ, whom he hath constituted Sovereign of angels and men, and of all his dominions and subjects, *both which are in heaven and which are on earth*, that for his glory and the good of the whole society, he should with supreme authority preside over all." If it were necessary, we might quote from other expositors who have never been suspected of the least tendency to what are called Millenarian opinions, statements going to show that the glorious consummation described by Paul is still future, and that a period is approaching when our Lord Jesus Christ shall "with supreme authority preside over all." We shall not presume to affirm, in the absence of a clear Scripture warrant, that the primary design of the long delay of the Redeemer's incarnation, and of the long interval between his first and second advent, was to afford time and room for a complete display of what man can do to retrieve the consequences of his apostasy, but we apprehend that none will deny that such an experiment is one of the results of this divine arrangement, an experiment fitted to convince the most sceptical of the absolute necessity of that interposition in behalf of our race, which the gospel reveals as having been already made in the mission and death of the Son of God, and which, it predicts, shall be repeated in another form, by the appearance of "that same Jesus" in the glory of his Father, as King of kings and Lord of lords.

The history of our world during the first four thousand years of its existence, establishes the fact beyond all gain-saying, that the human mind could never have discovered the true remedy for the manifold evils introduced by the fall. Whether it proves more than this, may, by some, perhaps be doubted. It might be said, grant that the experience of ages, the manifest worthlessness of all the specifics devised by human wisdom to heal the moral diseases of the human family, puts the inability of man to discover the proper remedy beyond doubt, it may still be affirmed that he is quite capable of applying the remedy, when once it is made known to him. He needs no other help. Under the guidance of his own reason he can travel surely and safely on the path of life, after it has been clearly revealed. But it is needless to put the case hypothetically, for such views of the spiritual capacities of man have obtained in all ages, and

are held by many now. The saying of a Grecian sage, that if virtue should appear on earth in human form, the whole world would join in doing her reverent homage, has been repeated by many a Christian divine. Is this true? The history of the last eighteen centuries gives a very emphatic and decisive answer to the question.

The advent of the Son of God was at once the terminating point of one series of experiments, illustrative of the capacities of man to discover the remedy for his moral wants, and the starting point of another series, equally illustrative of his ability to apply the remedy when found. The promise of a Saviour twice given to the entire race, and twice forgotten by the larger part of it, is at length fulfilled. The Messiah whose coming had been the theme of prophecy and poetry through a long tract of ages, at length personally appears on earth, and accomplishes the work of obedience and atonement given him to do; he broke down the barriers that confined the true religion within the narrow limits of Judea, he set up a new dispensation, so resplendent for its light and liberty as to cast all previous ones into the shade; a dispensation, whose external forms as well as its doctrines adapted it to all countries, and to all conditions of society; and while he directed those who were charged with its propagation to begin their work at Jerusalem, expressly commanded them to teach all nations. Viewing Christianity in the strong contrast it presents to Judaism and to Gentile Philosophy, not to speak of Polytheism, one might have imagined that a speedy and universal triumph awaited it; that its claims, so soon as they were fairly presented, would win their way to every heart. How the world received it and its divine author, the history of the primitive church abundantly shows. The Sun of Righteousness, heralded by the morning star of the old economy, arose full-orbed, "with healing under his wings;" but was his coming hailed with joy by the myriads groping their way amid the thick darkness of pagan superstition, or the dim shadows of Jewish types? Did the nations whom he came to save, turn with glad accord to gaze upon his softened splendor, eager to drink in his beams? No. The light shone in darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not.

The triumphs of the gospel during the first of those greater

periods into which the history of the Christian church is commonly divided, were indeed glorious. It encountered, as we know, the bitterest opposition from Jew and Gentile. Rich as were the blessings which it promised and conferred, in every land its approach was as obstinately resisted as if its presence had involved the direst miseries of war, pestilence, and famine; a fact, by the way, wholly inexplicable except on the hypothesis that human nature has become so radically depraved that "men love darkness rather than light." Within little more than two centuries after the command was given to the apostles to "go, and teach all nations," scarcely a region could be named within the limits of the Roman empire, into which the heralds of the cross had not penetrated. The church, with a world in arms against her, worked her way, often through seas of blood, until she reached and entered the very palace of the Cæsars, and Christianity became the established religion of the empire. By this rapid spread, and these marvellous victories, the New Dispensation gave a fresh proof of its dignity, by evincing its adaptedness to meet the moral wants of man, and that it possessed all the requisite conditions of an universal religion. It displayed an innate energy, a mastery over the human heart, a power to remould human character, which could be accounted for only on the supposition of its being the instrument through which Omnipotence operates.

As before hinted, the very features of Christianity that adapted it for universal diffusion—the fewness and simplicity of its outward forms, the clear enunciation of its peculiar doctrines, the whole system of truth being brought within the compass of a single volume of very moderate dimensions, a volume which every human being was entitled to possess, and bound to study for himself—these features, we say, would seem to render it an easy task both to spread the Christian faith, and to keep it free of all corrupting admixtures. Even if the New Testament had not been written, if the church had been left dependent upon tradition for the preservation of her faith and her franchises, one might have imagined that both would be quite safe, and that each succeeding generation would guard with the most jealous care the priceless deposit with which they were intrusted not for their own benefit alone, but for that of coming ages. To

guard, however, against all possible risk of loss or of adulteration, the divine author of the gospel embodied its facts, doctrines, and laws in the written word, in holy Scripture.

It might be said by those who exalt the religious tendencies and capacities of the man, his innate power not indeed to discover divine truth, but to recognise it when revealed, that even the rejection and persecution of Christianity in its early ages, is not a fair and conclusive proof of the falsity of their theory. They might say, we admit that in rejecting and persecuting the gospel they rejected and persecuted the truth, but then great allowance should be made for them, since truth came to them in a form not only new, but one which gave a sudden and wide shock to their inveterate prejudices and most deeply seated habits. No wonder that the miracles of the gospel did not produce instant conviction in the minds of men whose ancestral religions all claimed to rest upon a basis more or less miraculous. Some time would be necessarily required to dissipate the mists of prejudice, and to bring the evidence of the divinity of the gospel fairly before the popular mind. Let us admit that the treatment of Christ and his apostles furnishes no decisive proof of the spiritual impotency of man, or of his love of darkness in preference to light. The fact thus set aside is only one of a series. We are in a position to take a wider survey, one extending over a long tract of centuries, and including within its limits a nominally Christian world.

What, then, are we taught in reference to the spiritual capacities of man, by the history of the society founded by Christ himself, whose first ministers bore his own immediate commission, were endowed with extraordinary powers, and were intrusted with the oracles of God? To obtain a satisfactory answer to this inquiry, let us examine the first great period of ecclesiastical history, viz. that extending from the day of Pentecost to the final overthrow of Paganism. We see, at the outset, a most remarkable social organization, a community made up of men, Jews and Gentiles, called out of darkness into light—a society divine in its origin and endowments, consisting mainly, if not wholly, of regenerated men, and possessed of an instrument, “the powerful Word of God,” fitted to revolutionize and regenerate the world. It will certainly be admitted that never before was humanity

placed in circumstances so favorable for the full development of any innate tendencies remaining in it towards God and goodness, and for successfully struggling with that mysterious evil agency which had exerted during so many ages such a disastrous influence upon the fortunes of our race. What now is the lesson taught by the history of the Christian church itself? It is essentially the same as those with which the previous history of the world for four thousand years is so full—that man's own energies are utterly inadequate to the task of effecting his deliverance from the mighty grasp of that evil which his apostasy brought into the world; that the leaven of sin is perpetually at work, permeating the entire mass of human nature, so that no form of society which that nature may assume, not one even of divine construction, is exempt from its deadly influence, or can hinder its corrupting every source of life. In a word, from the new experiment we get a new discovery of sin reigning unto death, we see it entering within the very precincts of the newly constructed house of the living God, to deface and defile it; we see it seducing the visible spouse of the Redeemer, and converting her into "the mother of harlots and abominations;" in fine, we see it corrupting the divine remedy for human guilt and woe, so as to make it the occasion of giving a tremendous stimulus to the disease which afflicts our race, and of introducing forms of wickedness unmatched by any recorded even in the dark annals of Paganism.

The New Testament furnishes us with numerous testimonies that "the mystery of iniquity," to use its own expressive phrase, had begun to develope itself within the bosom of the church, a considerable time before the termination of the apostolic age. The epistles were addressed to congregations of believers resident in widely distant localities, and with scarce an exception, we discover in them tokens that agencies were at work "among their own selves," endangering the purity of their faith, of their morals, or of both, and subjecting them to an incessant struggle in defence of the gospel against the treason of professed friends as well as the physical force of open enemies. On this point it is needless to enter into particulars with which every biblical student must be familiar. Suffice it to say, that the apostles labored

hard to nip these evils in the bud. Their letters to the churches were evidently intended to guard them against dangers of whose presence they had ample evidence—to correct disorders, to refute heresy, as well as to expound the positive doctrines of the Christian system. And no doubt their efforts for the maintenance of the cause of truth, yielded much precious fruit in their own day; nor can it be questioned that by the labors of the holy men who immediately succeeded them—those who are justly styled “the apostolic fathers,” as their scanty literary remains show that they were deeply imbued with the apostolic spirit—the visible body of Christ was largely edified, not only by the increase of its numbers, but also by the development of its spiritual life. Still the history of the church during the period which is commonly and justly regarded as her most glorious epoch, supplies the most decisive proof that she had thus early received an impress from the very influences which it was her special mission to resist and destroy. During the first three centuries, the church was in a condition in which one might have supposed it scarcely possible for human passion or folly operating *ab intra* to do her serious damage. She was involved in a “great fight of afflictions,” and was forced to maintain an almost incessant battle for her existence. To confess Christ then, was to imperil all that men hold dear. What was there to tempt a carnal man to embark in such a cause? Nothing. On the contrary, the circumstances of the church were in every way and pre-eminently fitted to repel the carnal, the ambitious, the hypocrite, the mere enthusiast; in a word, all who were not actuated by a clear and overpowering conviction of the divine authority of the gospel of Christ. Yet in spite of these repelling circumstances, while the fires of persecution were blazing in all their fierceness, while the church was wandering in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth, compelled to worship at midnight in the lonely cemeteries, or in the dark, damp catacombs, we know that carnality and ambition were not strangers to the visible fellowship of saints; we know that the germs of a system of iniquity the most enormous that the world ever saw—the very masterpiece of Satan,—were developed with a marvellous rapidity. Judaism and Gentilism, apparently so antago-

nistic to each other, exerted a constant and concurrent influence upon the church in the way of corrupting her faith and her forms.

It would require much more space than we have at command, to discuss the causes of this declension, and minutely to trace its progress, even if we had the means of doing it. Unfortunately, the remains of the Christian literature of the first and second centuries are too scanty to do full justice to the subject. But it is not necessary for our purpose. It is the undeniable fact that the church began very early to decline from her pristine purity, with which we are chiefly concerned. While the distinctive articles of the Christian faith were held fast, and asserted with unflinching boldness against all opposers, other doctrines crept in by which the vital influence of those precious gospel truths which were embodied in the recognised creeds of the church, was seriously weakened or entirely annulled. The ministry, instituted by Christ mainly as an agency of instruction to "teach all nations," gradually assumed the character, and affected to discharge the functions of a priesthood; and at length a wide gulf separated the pastor and his flock, the clergy and the laity. Baptism and the Lord's supper were converted into "tremendous mysteries." Celibacy was regarded as essential to the highest virtue; while marriage, "honorable in all," was held, by not a few, to be little better than a decent sort of adultery. Not only were the foundations of monasticism laid, but the superstructure was carried a good way up. The wealth, the power, the pomp of many bishops, especially in the larger cities, would have filled the hearts of the apostles with amazement and horror.

There are those who, either for party purposes, through party prejudices, or from sheer ignorance of Christian antiquity, are accustomed to represent the corruptions above mentioned, as the immediate offspring of the policy of Constantine. It was the union of church and state, they would have us believe, that became to the former the Pandora's box—the source of all the evils that darkened and defiled her history through succeeding centuries. One of the ablest writers* of the present day maintains that the measures taken

* Isaac Taylor, *Spiritual Despotism*, p. 194.

by Constantine were a positive benefit to the church, in other respects besides the security they afforded her of exemption from wasting persecution, that "the pure voluntary principle, as applied to the maintenance of the clergy, had, at the close of the third century, reached a point at which, as well for the good of the community as for the preservation and honor of the church, it needed some effectual check; that such a check, drawn from motives of good sense or piety, was not available, and that nothing could have taken hold of it but a vigorous interference on the part of the state." Be this as it may, the fact is beyond question that the manifold evils supposed by many to have originated in the policy of Constantine, and which, no doubt, were stimulated by the change in the political relations of the church, were actively at work within her bosom, long before that great emperor was born. If any one desires proofs of this averment, he will find them in abundance in the writings of Cyprian—a man eminent for his personal holiness, for his labors and sufferings in the cause of Christ—himself "a faithful martyr," yet in no small measure infected by the leaven of corruption. We of course do not mean to deny the existence, or even the prevalence, of real piety in the church, during and after the days of Cyprian. Her history contains not a few bright pages. She held the grand verities of the gospel with a tough grasp which all the power of the persecutor could not make her relax. Her fellowship included multitudes of humble followers of the Lamb, men and women who loved the faith once delivered to the saints, and who, in contending for it, "counted not their lives dear unto them." But, for all this, the records of the age bear us out in the assertion, that within less than three centuries the church had assumed a type materially different from "the mould into which" she "was delivered" by the apostles. The "gold had become dim and the fine gold changed." Nor was the declension the result simply of causes operating *ab extra*; it was to a large extent spontaneous, the work of professed, and in many instances of real saints—of men who had been called out of darkness and made partakers of a divine life. In the condition and tendencies of the church at the close of the third century of her existence in the new form which she put on after the coming of Christ, we are

presented with the results of an experiment, with reference to the capacities of human nature, differing in its most material circumstances from those that preceded. A community consisting mainly of regenerated men, including Jew and Gentile within its catholic fellowship, and possessing a clear and complete revelation of the Divine will, is put upon trial. If the history of the race during the earlier ages, proved the inability of man to discover the true remedy for his moral disease, the history of the church no less conclusively proves his incapacity to preserve, and properly apply the remedy after it has been made known; it thus appears that he not only could never have broken the chains of his bondage, but even after they have been severed by Almighty power, he could not maintain his freedom.

But it might be said, with a view to take off the edge of this conclusion, that the nature of the materials out of which the early church was constructed should be taken into account; the fact that her membership was mainly derived from nations in the last stages of their existence—nations whose character and habits had been formed under a civilization intensely corrupt; and that the evil leaven thus introduced had been allowed to operate without the least control by the state, with which religion had ever been in close alliance, or by that civil government which is as truly an ordinance of God as the church herself. If the experiment had stopped at the close of the period of which we have spoken, this consideration might have been regarded as having some weight; but as we follow the church through the stages of her subsequent career, we are compelled to own that it has no force whatever. At the period when Constantine became sole occupant of the imperial throne, the church, though much deteriorated, contained a large amount of living piety, as was manifest in the heroic fortitude with which she faced the storm of persecution excited by enemies who had avowed the fixed purpose to extirpate her from the earth—a storm which continued to rage up to the very moment when the palace of the Cæsars was so suddenly opened for her admission as an honored guest. The fires that had burned so long could not fail to consume a vast deal of dross. Again, it should not be forgotten, that the departure of the church from the simplicity of Christ during the

earlier years of comparative peace, was not unresisted. Warning voices were constantly heard; and along the whole line of her history we can trace a succession of faithful witnesses.

If the church, as a body, had a recuperative energy, an innate *vis medicatrix*, in virtue of which she could of herself arrest and throw off disease, and thus regain her proper normal condition, the era at which she not only won imperial favor, but was brought into an alliance with a Christian state, involving on its part guardianship and control, was precisely the period when we should have looked for the exercise of this intrinsic power. Constantine was neither her tyrant nor her slave. He did not attempt to define her faith, nor to interfere with her discipline. Not only was there no hindrance in the way of reform, there was everything to invite the church to employ the first moments of calm sunshine after "the windy storm and tempest" in a solemn survey of her past history, of her present position, of the great work she was called to do, and of the means by which alone it could be accomplished. Her spiritual independence had not yet been invaded; and there can be little doubt that her imperial patron would have lent his aid to any fair scheme of reform in which the mass of Christian pastors and people concurred. But we can discern no symptom of any such movement, nor is there any historical evidence that the thing was even thought of by pastors or by people. In virtue of the new relations between the church and the state, the bishops were no longer permitted to exercise their authority uncontrolled. True, their power in earlier times was only spiritual, but who does not know that the spiritual is the highest form of power. Look at Ireland. Who controls the masses there? Whose dominion over them is most peremptory and perfect? It is the priest that rules—not the priest of a lordly establishment, but of a merely tolerated sect. He dictates to electors the man for whom they must vote; he can at will rouse the turbulent elements of that unhappy land into active resistance to the laws. Yet his power is simply spiritual. And therefore it is idle to say that because the church before Constantine was free from state trammels there could have been no spiritual tyranny. We do not mean to intimate that the pastors of

the third century were of the same type with the priests of the nineteenth, but there can be no doubt that the former exercised a dominion over the faith of their people which the apostles expressly and earnestly repudiated. As the official dispensers of the cleansing waters of baptism, and of the "tremendous mystery" of the eucharist, they were regarded by multitudes as the virtual arbiters of their eternal destiny.

The change in the external condition of the church through the agency of Constantine was followed, after the lapse of a few generations, by a still more remarkable revolution, giving birth to those forms of society with whose annals, according to Sir James Macintosh, modern history begins. Beyond the bounds of Roman rule, in the far north, the fancied region of perpetual storms, "the fountains of the great deep are broken up," and a mighty flood rushes southwards in an ever deepening channel, and with an ever widening surface, until nearly all the ancient seats of empire and civilization are submerged. In a moral sense it might truly be said that "the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." Chaos ruled again. The old owners of the magnificent regions washed by the Mediterranean, the lands where art, science, commerce had for ages dwelt, debased and enfeebled by a luxurious refinement, were forced to transfer their possessions to a new and more vigorous race. We have not space even to give a brief summary of the stirring events connected with the overthrow of the Roman power in the west, of the successive invasions of the Gothic hosts. The new comers were indeed barbarians and pagans, but they were untainted by many of the degrading vices prevalent in the countries they subdued, and their religion, though of course unable to generate the purest morals, did not eradicate all virtue. The banners of the cross had been unfurled among some of these conquering hordes before they had crossed the Alps, and the rapidity with which at least nominal Christianity was spread among some of their tribes, would seem to indicate that there was in the Gothic mind a certain propension towards the gospel.

The period to which we have adverted was necessarily one of anarchy and violence, of intense and wide-spread misery.

Tempest succeeded tempest, of each of which it might be said, that the like had never been seen on earth. As from the summit of the Alpine range, which one might have regarded as an insurmountable barrier to such armies as Alaric led, that great conqueror gazed upon the outspread plains of Italy, he beheld a land blooming with beauty like the garden of the Lord; within a few short months his savage followers had converted it into a desolate wilderness. The terrible storm at length slowly abates its violence; the waters of the overflowing flood gradually subside; a new world is revealed to view, occupied by new races, containing the germs of a new order of things; the church enters upon a new stadium, with a fresh command from her divine head to teach all nations.

The actual effect upon the church of these two great revolutions, the first of which changed so materially the political relations of the Christian society, while the latter as effectually changed both the elements and the form of civil society, is too well known to need an extended description. Their only result was to stimulate into a more vigorous activity than ever, those elements of evil, which, through human weakness or wickedness, had become incorporated with the constitution of the church. Yet the native tendency of both these dispensations, and more especially of the latter, was to produce directly opposite results, to check the progress of declension, and to quicken the spirit of reform. The divine Head of the church spake to her in language as plain, if not a voice as audible as when he promulgated his law at Sinai; in the first instance, by the sudden extinction of the flames of persecution, combined as it was with the utter overthrow of the power that had so often kindled them; in the second, by subjecting the church (in common with the state) to another fiery trial in a new form, which was followed by another marvellous deliverance. With the Bible in her hands the church could not but know by whose agency these extraordinary events had been brought about; and aware as she was of the solemn warnings addressed by the faithful and true Witness to the churches of Asia Minor and recorded in the closing book of revelation, she could be in no doubt that "the windy storm and tempest" had been allowed to beat against her; that she had shared in "the

temptation which came upon all the world," because she had left her first love.

Nor was this all. Besides the general teachings of the Scriptures, in regard to the moral government of God, she had the more specific declarations of the prophetic word, "as a light shining in a dark place." In that "sure word of prophecy," the full-length portrait of the Antichrist was drawn; it contained predictions of the ultimate overthrow of that mighty empire, whose limits reached to the furthest bounds of the earth, not merely as a future event of the utmost political importance, but as being closely connected with the coming of "that man of sin and son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Whether the Roman empire was truly the hindrance to the development of the man of sin to which St. Paul refers, is a question not necessary to be discussed here; but there can be no doubt that such was the prevailing opinion among the earlier fathers. And hence they looked with a solemn awe upon those indications of the decline of the Roman Power which could not fail to suggest themselves to serious and thinking men, and to beget the conviction that the dreadful catastrophe which should usher in "that Wicked" could not be very distant. "We pray," says Tertullian, in his noble Apology, "for the emperors and the empire of Rome, because we know that it is the Roman empire which holds back calamities threatening the whole earth, and the end of the world itself." In the next century, Lactantius declared "all things will ere long totter and fall, only there seems no reason to fear it while the city of Rome is safe." We might quote other passages that show that during this period there was a widespread persuasion that when the dominion of Rome terminated, "the end of all things was at hand." And therefore, when the church beheld province after province subjugated by the Gothic hordes; when at length the rude banner of the barbarian was seen waving over the Eternal city, as she proudly styled herself, and imperial Rome sank to rise no more; it was as if the voice of the Son of God had been heard from out of the heaven of heavens where he sits enthroned, proclaiming in the ear of universal Christendom, the time is

- at hand. Surely, if ever God addresses men in other ways than through the medium of his written word, if his providential dispensations have an intelligible meaning, it must be owned that he then spake to his church in tones loud enough, one should think, to awake the dead, calling upon her to repent, to do her first works, to return to her first love, and thus to prepare herself for the reconquest of the world.

If the church possessed a self-reformative energy, the events to which we have adverted were pre-eminently fitted to call it forth into vigorous activity. But whatever impression was made by them on the general mind of Christendom or upon those who formed and guided the opinions of the masses, it was not of a kind to check the progress of corruption; on the contrary, the dread inspired by the apprehended nearness of the day of judgment, seems rather to have stimulated the superstitious tendencies of the age. The light which still shone in darkness, and now and then in particular localities, blazed forth with a glorious effulgence, waxed more and more dim, until at last a night of pitchy darkness settled down upon the Christian world.

But it might be said that the deplorable condition of the church, during the ages that are well styled Dark, her deep ignorance, superstition, idolatry, or, in a word, the inroads of the old paganism under a Christian name, were owing, if not wholly, at least in great part, to causes over which the church had no control. The means for the diffusion of knowledge, spiritual and secular, were so limited as to render the elevation of the masses of society above a very low point, a simple impossibility. The press had no existence; books were costly; bibles were rare; a popular religious literature was a thing not so much as dreamed of. Hence the lay membership of the church were entirely dependent upon the clergy for religious knowledge, and even the great majority of the clergy were nearly, if not quite, as destitute of libraries, as the flocks to whom they ministered. Free discussion, independent research, so essential to the discovery and the spread of truth, was not to be looked for, unless among a few of the loftiest and richest dignitaries, from the utter want of the necessary helps. No wonder, therefore, that the knowing few so easily led captive the ignorant

many, and persuaded them into the belief of all manner of lying legends; and that the few faithful witnesses against the reigning superstition, and for the truth in Jesus, who from time to time appeared, were so easily overborne. In a word, the virulence of the distemper by which the church was infected, was much more owing to the want of the requisite conveniences for applying the remedies in her possession, than to any subjective tendency to disease. We might have felt that this explanation had a great deal of plausibility, if the experimental process had terminated with the dark ages; but there was still another trial awaiting the church, and a cursory survey of its results will suffice to show that such an explanation is quite inadmissible.

After a long night of centuries, the dawn of a coming day is discerned. In various parts of Europe, the germs of a new intellectual life show themselves, which are soon after quickened into a growth of marvellous rapidity, by that grandest of human inventions—the Press. Books, once so costly and so rare as to form a fit present for a prince, are now brought within the reach of the poorest peasant. The book of books, the Bible, once found only in the libraries of monarchs and monasteries, was now to be seen in many a cottage of the poor. Almost at the same moment, and at points widely distant from each other—amid the Alpine mountains and on the plains of Germany—the heralds of a recovered gospel are heard proclaiming its glad tidings to all nations. The long lost doctrine of a free salvation is again preached; the right of every man to search the Scriptures for himself, and to interpret their contents, responsible to God alone for his faith, is boldly asserted. Not only is it asserted; thousands in many lands exercise it. The movement begun by Luther and Zwingli rapidly extends itself from country to country, among all classes of society, so that long before the close of that generation nearly the whole of northern Europe is emancipated from Romish bondage, and the church reformed assumes a distinct and independent organization.

More than three centuries have elapsed since that great religious revolution, the parent of so many others of a political and social nature. What has been the history of Protestantism, and what light does it cast upon the capacities

and tendencies of human nature? That the world has reaped from the Reformation blessings manifold and rich, can be denied only by the blindest bigotry. Candid Romanists have acknowledged as much. Wherever Protestantism has gone, literature, science, commerce, the useful arts have followed in her train; she has founded colleges by hundreds, and common schools by thousands; the offspring of a struggle for religious liberty, of a contest for the freedom wherewith Christ made his people free, she has prompted inquiry in regard to the rights of men as members of society, as the subjects of government. To the Protestant Reformation, Britain and America owe the chief elements of their grandeur and their power. Compare North America with South, Scotland with Spain, England with Italy, Prussia with Austria, how strong and how uniform the contrast! Compare continent with continent, or kingdom with kingdom, or canton with canton, you meet the same diverse results; on the one hand, an intense intellectual life, science gaining fresh triumphs, commercial enterprise, growing wealth, schools, colleges, personal freedom, and a high standard of social morality; while on the other hand, you as invariably find ignorance, superstition, poverty, vice, in a word, all the symptoms of social paralysis. We could show that the results first enumerated are the native fruits of that "glorious gospel" with the revived preaching of which Protestantism started into being. Most emphatically has the Reformation vindicated its claim to be regarded as a divinely originated movement.

But the question arises, why is the church of the Reformation, after the lapse of three centuries, confined within such narrow limits? Why did she not, from her very birth, go on conquering and to conquer? She occupied a higher vantage ground than the church had ever before held, since the days of the apostles; she possessed instrumentalities for the preservation of her own purity, and for the rapid propagation of the faith, which were wanting even in the primitive church. The recovered gospel encountered, indeed, the fierce opposition of mighty enemies, but it enjoyed at the same time the protection of powerful friends. If emperors and kings mustered their forces to put it down, other princes were prepared to jeopard their crowns in its defence. Again,

limited as was the power of the press of Luther's day as compared with that of our own, its capacities were still sufficiently developed to render it a mighty agent for the propagation of truth. The Bible, the catechism, the prayer-book, the religious treatise, whether in the form of the tract, the sermon, or the solid volume, were all brought within the reach of the masses. Many of those difficulties which in former ages impeded the triumph of the church were now removed; and it might have been imagined by the contemporaries of the Reformers, that the glorious days foretold by the prophets could not be far off, when the knowledge of the Lord should cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. We need not say that if such hopes were entertained, they were destined to be bitterly disappointed. Protestantism, as we have before observed, can point to many noble monuments of its elevating power, to many proofs of its divine origin; yet no one untinctured with prejudice can read its history without feelings of deep sadness; or could survey its present condition, and still retain a sanguine hope of the coming of the period when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, were it not for the express divine promise that this blessed consummation awaits the world.

The church of the Reformation has scarcely assumed an independent organization before we find her membership, in spite of the imperative necessity of union, split into two antagonistic and irreconcilable communions, not by difference of opinion about some fundamental article of faith, but in regard to the meaning of an external rite. Bibles in almost every tongue are multiplied and scattered like the leaves of autumn; men are rightly taught that God alone is the Lord of conscience; they are exhorted to exercise their divinely given privilege to investigate all things for themselves. And what have been the results of their liberal use of the right of private judgment? Among them are to be reckoned truculent fanaticism, monstrous heresy, downright infidelity, multitudinous and strangely variegated sectarianism. We do not by any means intend to say that these have been the chief results, and as little would we be understood to intimate that they are the legitimate result of that free inquiry which Protestantism favors; but none can deny that such consequences have been produced; that men with the Bible in

their hands, have attempted to make it sanction fanaticism, heresy, and sectarianism in their worst forms.

The space that remains to us will not permit us to dwell upon the condition of the church in the very countries where the Reformation began. What it is now, what it has been for many years, is sufficiently known to our readers to render a description needless. A cold, lifeless orthodoxy was succeeded by a colder rationalism, which utterly extinguished spiritual vitality; and now the necessity of reform is not less urgent than it was in the beginning of the sixteenth century. During the greatest part of the last century, it seemed as if the entire Protestant church had fallen into a deep sleep, or had been struck by paralysis; so few and faint were the indications of spiritual health and activity to be discerned in one of her numerous branches. Her slumbers are at length partially broken. The wants and woes of the pagan world begin to engage attention, to enlist sympathy, to excite effort. Bible, mission, tract societies are formed on a basis so catholic that all who "hold the Head even Christ" might occupy. Christians are ashamed that so vast an amount of energy has been expended in the defence of politics and forms, while so little was done to extend the common Christianity. On many a platform nothing was heard but the language of mutual love—urgent entreaties that Christians should "agree to differ," while they unitedly labored to propagate "the things in which they were agreed." The appeals are in vain. The spirit of missions, to which the church for so many ages had been an almost total stranger, reappears in the midst of her; and soon the heralds of the gospel are seen upon their way to the dark and distant islands of the sea. Many a pious soul imagined that the splendors of the millennial day had actually dawned. The institutions to which this revival of the spirit of Christian aggressiveness gave birth have greatly multiplied in number, and are at the present moment in full activity; but can it be said with truth that those who now manage them are animated by a zeal as unselfish and unsectarian as that displayed by their venerable fathers? We venture to affirm that it cannot. In truth, nothing can be plainer than the tendency of missionary zeal to put on a sectarian type. Fifty years ago it seemed as if Christians were on the point

of forgetting their differences under the influence of a common sympathy for the heathen. Now, we have mission boards of every sectarian name; and while we do not mean to deny the existence of a cordial Christian sympathy for the heathen, in the hearts of their members, yet, if we could suppose that Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, and others, were actuated by blind party zeal alone, we cannot conceive what forms their aggressive efforts could assume other than those which now exist. If the subject were not too delicate for discussion, we could easily show that our other great benevolent institutions have already felt the influence of human infirmity. But we must bring our observations to a close.

From this hasty survey of the more remarkable epochs in the history of the church, we discover in her a perpetual tendency to depart from her proper normal state. Neither the clear teachings of a completed Bible nor the recorded experience of centuries, neither the warnings of prophecy nor the lessons of history, have sufficed to secure her against the seductions of the arch-enemy of God and man. It matters not how greatly her external circumstances may change, whether amid the fires of persecution or the palaces of princes, whether she possesses few means for diffusing knowledge or many, whether she is compelled laboriously to write her Bibles one by one with the pen, or enabled by the press to print and scatter them by thousands, we still encounter the agents of evil within her borders, and find them actively at work. What immense pains have been taken at various times by men of distinguished holiness to maintain the church's faith and life "pure and vigorous;" they have made secessions, disruptions, reformations; by means of rigid examinations, elaborate confessions, and all sorts of canons, they have tried to raise a wall around the garden of the Lord so high that no evil wind could reach it. Vain attempt! Within "the garden inclosed," in its very soil, lie hid the elements of evil, the sources of corruption. Such is the lesson taught by every reformation that has ever been made, whether on a large or a limited scale; before its authors are in their grave the symptoms of declension appear.

We may not presume to affirm that the successive stadia

through which the church has gone, have been expressly arranged by infinite wisdom, for the purpose of trying what man can do towards his own deliverance from the thralldom of evil, even with the aid of a positive revelation ; but we may assert that if such an experiment had been intended, it could scarcely have yielded results more decisive than those which we may gather inferentially from the annals of the Christian church. Her whole history proclaims with a voice loud as the sound of many waters, that *sin is exceeding sinful*. It supplies proofs such as can be found nowhere else of the mighty hold which sin has taken of humanity ; here we see it casting its deadly poison into the very fountains which grace has opened, converting the richest gifts of God into occasions of the direst evils that ever befell our race ; here we see that Satan is accustomed, as of old, to appear among the sons of God, and can induce even sanctified men to become the blind or the willing instruments of his plans, and can persuade them to think that while under him they are doing God service. The history of the church most impressively teaches the absolute necessity of a divine interposition in order to the complete deliverance of man from the dominion of sin. No partial help will suffice ; with the divine remedy in his hands he will perish unless God himself apply it. Strange that any one, who surveys the records of past ages or the present state of Christendom, can imagine that the millennial blessedness which awaits the world is to be realized by the simple extension of the church as she now is over the whole earth. Neither Scripture nor experience warrants any such hope ; they both point us to Immanuel as the only deliverer ; and as the one proclaims as with a thousand tongues, that the emancipation of our world from the bondage of corruption can be effected only by his *immediate* interference, so the other gives us the promise that he will in due time take to himself his great power and reign, and teaches us to pray for the accomplishment of the Father's purpose, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times to gather together all things in Christ."

ART. VI.—LETTERS TO A MILLENARIAN. By the Rev. A. Williamson, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Chester, New Jersey. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852.

A WRITER who undertakes to solve an important problem, in respect to which the opinions of men are divided, and weaves for the purpose a long train of argument, can scarcely fail of his object in a more unfortunate manner than to miss the true conclusion to which his reasonings should conduct him. Into this embarrassing error Mr. Williamson appears to have fallen. His object is to show that "the present Jews are not the lawful heirs of the Abrahamic will," but that they have disinherited themselves; and that Gentile or Christian believers have succeeded as heirs in their place. In the covenant with Abraham, God promised four things. First, to bless him personally. Next, to make of him a great nation. Thirdly, to give to him and his descendants the land of Canaan. And fourthly, through him to bless all nations. The third is expressed in the following language: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed FOREVER. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length and breadth of it, for I will give it unto thee."—Gen. xii. 1-7; xiii. 14-17. Now of these four blessings, that which Mr. Williamson maintains has been forfeited by the Israelites, is the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and the peculiar privileges that were connected with its possession. It is to that inheritance, of course, if his argument is valid, that Gentile or Christian believers succeed. And as those who inherit it, whoever they are, are to possess it for ever, it follows that those Gentile heirs are to migrate to Palestine, take possession of it, and occupy it for ever: and as the believers of all past ages from the institution of the Christian church, if his representation is correct, are inheritors as much as those of the present or future times, it follows also that those of them who have passed into the invisible world, are to return, in order

to enjoy their share in the gift; and thence that their possession of the land is to be subsequent to their resurrection from the dead. The whole body of believers, then, who shall have died from the day of Christ's ascension down to his second coming, are, on their resurrection, to take up their final residence in the land of Canaan; and all believers also who are then living are to remove there, and receive, and with their posterity, occupy it as their everlasting possession!

This beautiful result of his argument, however, Mr. Williamson, by an extraordinary inconsideration, has wholly failed to perceive. Not a suspicion appears to have crossed his mind that this is the doctrine he endeavors to substitute for that which is entertained by millenarians. Not a ray of the new and unexpected light he has thrown on the subject seems to have reached his own eyes. He utters not a solitary congratulation to his anti-millenarian friends at the brilliant prospects he thus unfolds to them. He indulges in no expressions of hope or curiosity respecting the city or village, the valley or hill, where his own happy lot is to fall. Unaware, however, as he is of it, it is most certainly the conclusion to which his reasoning legitimately leads. The promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham's seed as an everlasting inheritance, is as specific and absolute as any of the other promises of the covenant with him. It is the only one, indeed, that is directly represented as perpetual. "As for me, my covenant shall be with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee: and I will make thee exceedingly fruitful, and will make nations of thee; and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan FOR AN EVERLASTING POSSESSION, and I will be their God."—Gen. xvii. 4–8. Here, indeed, the parties to whom the land was promised are expressly defined as his seed; the nations that were to be made of him; and that seed, "in their generations after

him;" but whoever they may be supposed to be, it is indisputably pledged to them as a permanent possession; as everlasting as the covenant itself is by which it is promised. If, then, as Mr. Williamson contends, Gentile or Christian believers universally have become the absolute and exclusive heirs of that promise, it follows inevitably that they are in fact to be put in possession of Canaan, and occupy it as an everlasting inheritance; and as to those of them who have died, or may hereafter die, a resurrection will be necessary in order to their obtaining the promise; their enjoyment of the gift is to follow their resurrection: and thence the whole elect church, whether now or hereafter, in heaven or on earth, are at Christ's second coming to be gathered in Palestine, and receive that as their everlasting abode. Mr. W. can no more show that this part of the covenant is not to be verified, than he can that its others are not. He does not directly attempt to show it. Instead, it seems wholly to have passed from his notice that it is one of the blessings promised to Abraham and his seed. He conducts his argument and frames his conclusion precisely as though the blessings enumerated in the covenant were exclusively those of redemption that are now conferred on Gentile believers.

Such is the conclusion to which Mr. W. should have been borne by his reasoning; and such is the doctrine to which they must assent who accept his assumptions and arguments as legitimate. Is it probable that the intelligent and cautious, left as it is without a shadow of proof to sustain it, will prefer to embrace it, rather than yield their faith to the doctrine entertained by millenarians, which is sustained by a great body of the most direct and express testimonies of Scripture?

But Mr. W. is mistaken in the assumption on which he proceeds throughout his argument, that Gentile believers succeed as heirs to all the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant. The blessings which they obtain through Abraham, are those exclusively which are directly promised them in that covenant; namely, that through him all families of the earth should be blessed; by which it is meant that they should be partakers of the redemption which was to be accomplished by the Messiah. There is no intimation here, or in any other part of the sacred volume, that they

were to obtain any of the other gifts promised in the covenant. There is none of the others, except the promise of the land of Canaan, of which they could be partakers. But the promise of that land was made exclusively to Abraham's lineal descendants. The seed to which God gave it, was his seed that came "after" him "in their generations," and to them he gave it "for an everlasting possession." And it is to his lineal descendants, in like manner, that all the promises are made of a restoration from captivities and dispersions, and a final possession of Canaan for ever. If Mr. Williamson would show that this part of the covenant with them is abrogated, or that the Gentile church has succeeded to their right to the inheritance of their land, he should produce some passage from the sacred volume in which it is expressly taught. He alleges nothing of the kind, however; nor can he. There is not a hint in the word of God, that this great promise, reiterated a thousand times in the ancient prophets, has been rescinded; nor that Gentile believers have been substituted in the place of the Israelites as inheritors of the sacred land. That part of the covenant renewed in almost every book of the Old Testament, reiterated in a great variety of forms, and confirmed by the most solemn and emphatic pledges, remains untouched by Mr. Williamson's reasonings, and cannot be erased from the Pentateuch or the prophets by any process that does not strike the covenant itself from their pages.

Mr. W. has thus overlooked the fact, on the one hand, that spiritual blessings were promised in the covenant, through Abraham to the Gentiles; and the fact, on the other, that the inheritance of the land of Canaan, with the peculiar privileges and gifts that were to be connected with it, were promised exclusively to the lineal descendants of Abraham: and has confounded the participation of the Gentiles in the blessings of the gospel, with their succeeding as heirs of Canaan in the place of the Israelites: and it is by this extraordinary error that he has fallen into the fancy that the Israelites are no longer heirs of that which is exclusively promised to them. Instead of this mistaken notion, the covenant plainly declares that all the families of the earth were to be blessed through Abraham, by being made partakers of the redemption the Messiah was to accomplish:

and that is the doctrine of every part of the Old Testament. In all the great predictions of the coming and reign of the Redeemer, it is expressly foreshown that all the Gentiles are to become obedient to his sceptre, and share in the infinite gifts of his salvation; and it is accordingly announced in the New Testament, that he had by his death broken down the wall that had before separated Gentiles from Israelites, and given to both equal access to the Father. The effect of his sacrifice and abolition of the Hebrew ritual was not, as Mr. W. imagines, to substitute the Gentiles as heirs of the covenant in the place of the Israelites, and to their exclusion; but that the Gentiles, who had before been altogether aliens and foreigners, then became "fellow citizens with the saints," who were of Israelitish descent, "and of the household of God;" and were "built" like Hebrew believers, "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building," whether of Israelitish or Gentile descent, "fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord," Eph. ii. 11-22. There was no disinheritance therefore of the Israelites, and substitution of Gentiles in their place, as heirs of the covenant. There was only an admission of the Gentiles to a joint participation of its spiritual blessings which were promised them in the covenant itself, as absolutely as they were promised to the lineal descendants of Abraham; and to which they would have been admitted, if the Israelites had not generally rejected Christ, and been driven into exile for their unbelief. Paul, accordingly, everywhere exhibits the Gentiles as having become "fellow heirs" with the Jews, not as having superseded them, and gained an exclusive title to their inheritance of the covenant; and he represents the communication of this fact to him, as the revelation of the great mystery with which he was intrusted by Christ. "Ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given to me to you ward, how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I have already written briefly, whereby ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by his Spirit:—*That the Gentiles should be FELLOW HEIRS, and of THE*

SAME BODY, and PARTAKERS of his PROMISE IN CHRIST by the gospel: whereof I was made a minister according to the gift of the grace of God . . . that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is *the fellowship* of the mystery"—or joint participation of Gentiles and Jews in the riches of Christ's redemption—"which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ, that *now* to the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," Eph. iii. 2-11. It was *fellow heirs* of the blessings of the gospel which the Gentiles thus became, not exclusive heirs, as Mr W. represents, of all the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant. But beyond this, the apostle expressly declares, that God had not cast away his people the Israelites, but had at that time a remnant of them, according to a gracious election; and that though as a nation they had fallen through unbelief, their fall was not to be perpetual, but only for a time, till the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, when all Israel is to be saved, by the coming of the Deliverer to Zion, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for that is his covenant with them when he shall take away their sins, Rom. xi. 12-27. Mr. Williamson's whole fancy that the Israelites have ceased to be the heirs of the covenant, is thus a mere dream, not only without a shadow of authority from the word of God, but against its most specific and clearest teachings.

The assumptions and arguments by which he endeavors to sustain this unscriptural representation are, as might be expected, of much the same character as the notion itself. They are not only without any authority from the word of God, but are generally marked by extreme extravagance of error and absurdity.

Thus, the first consideration which he alleges to prove that the Israelites are not now heirs of the covenant, is that the whole of Abraham's descendants were never the subjects of its promises. He says:—

"We have seen that in the third generation, only one-sixteenth part of the descendants of Abraham were actually counted as the heirs

of the promise to Abraham, to whom God would give the land of Canaan—a very small part, when yet the promises were as full to them then, as they are now to the seed of Abraham; for they were the same, and if these promises did not prove THAT ALL THE SEED OF ABRAHAM WERE THEN HEIRS, *how can they prove that all or ANY of those who now claim to be descended from Abraham; are the lawful heirs?*”—P. 29.

He thus boldly claims that inasmuch as the whole of Abraham's offspring were not subjects of the covenant promises, and that only a part of the descendants of Isaac were heirs; those promises furnish no proof that *any* of the present Israelites are heirs of the covenant. A more extraordinary postulate, we suspect, was never advanced by a bewildered speculatist. It is nothing else than the assumption, that unless the whole of a race are the subjects of a covenant respecting a line of descendants, and are actually made partakers of the blessings which it promises, there can be no proof from the covenant itself, that after a certain time *any* of that line are heirs of its promises: and that is nothing less than the assumption that there can be no certainty that a covenant that is everlasting, and is for ever to have heirs, can continue for ever, and for ever have heirs, unless the whole race to which those heirs belong, are inheritors and partakers of its blessings! But that will prove as effectually that there were no certain heirs among the descendants of Abraham in the days of Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, the judges, and the kings, as it will that there are none among his descendants now. If the fact that neither all the offspring of Abraham, nor all the offspring of Isaac, were originally subjects of the promise, divests us of all certainty that any of his present or future descendants are: why does it not render it equally uncertain that any of his descendants of that or any subsequent age were? If the heirship of the whole body of Abraham's descendants to the covenant which is for ever to have heirs, is a necessary condition to our assurance that any of his descendants are now heirs, have been for the last eighteen hundred years, or are hereafter to be; why is it not an equally necessary condition to an assurance that any of them were heirs at any former period? If the whole race must be

heirs, in order that one particular part of it may be, why must not the whole also be heirs, in order that any other part may be? The ground on which he proceeds thus is, that there can be no certainty that any of Abraham's offspring are heirs, unless the whole of them are; and that a covenant in respect to a line of offspring in perpetuity, cannot continue and be verified, unless it embrace the whole race to which that line belongs. But this assumption, if justifiable, is as valid in respect to the Gentiles, as it is to the Hebrews. If the fact that all the descendants of Abraham are not heirs of the covenant, proves that none of them are, why does not the fact that all the Gentiles are not heirs of the promises of that part of the covenant which respects them, prove that none of them are? If the fact that all the Israelites have not heretofore been made partakers of salvation, divests us of all certainty that any of them will hereafter be saved; why does not the fact that all the Gentiles are not now partakers of salvation, equally deprive us of all certainty that any of their future generations will be? But the assumption on which he proceeds, has a still wider sweep. In the hands of the Universalist, it will prove with equal certainty the converse, that, if any of mankind are saved, the whole of them must be. If God cannot promise to confer an endless train of blessings on descendants, and yet elect out of them, a series of individuals and families, to whom those gifts are to be confined;—if in order to the possibility of such a covenant, it must embrace all the members of the race to which that line of families belongs: the Universalist may then, on the same principle, claim that God cannot promise salvation to offspring of Adam in a perpetual series, and yet elect individuals out of his offspring as subjects of that promise, to the exclusion of others; but must extend the blessing to the whole of his descendants. It is truly surprising that any one who has read the Scriptures with tolerable attention, should involve himself in such a labyrinth of error and absurdity. There is no express pledge in the covenant with Abraham, that all his descendants should be made partakers of its blessings. So far from it, it only promised that God would give the land of Canaan and other blessings to his *seed*; that is, to persons who should descend from him. It was no violation, or change of that promise, that that seed was

afterwards defined as exclusively of the line of Isaac; and subsequently, that instead of embracing the two families that sprang from him, it was confined exclusively to the line of Jacob. Instead, the covenant was framed in harmony with the right God exercised at every stage of his subsequent procedure, of selecting according to his sovereign pleasure, the particular line out of the families that sprang from Abraham, and the particular families and individuals of that line, from generation to generation, that were to be made partakers of the promised gifts. The bestowment of those blessings on an election out of his offspring, was as absolute a fulfilment of the covenant, as the bestowment of them on the whole of his seed would have been. To deny this, is to deny the consistency of God's procedure with his covenant, in the bestowment of his gifts on the seed of Abraham: for he has indisputably, at every step of his administration under the covenant, exercised the right of either giving or denying its promised blessings to individuals and families of Abraham's race, as he pleased; and has at every stage confined them to an elect body and series of persons and families. Of the immediate descendants of Abraham he chose but one: of the immediate offspring of Isaac, he chose but one: of the children of Jacob he chose only the twelve sons: of those who went up out of Egypt, two only were put in possession of an inheritance in the land of Canaan: and during the wars and conquests to which they were subjected, from the death of Joshua to their dispersion by the Romans, there was an election only that remained in possession of the land; and an election only that were returned from their captivities: and throughout the whole of that period an election only were made partakers of the spiritual blessings of the covenant, and admitted to the inheritance of everlasting salvation. To assume then, as Mr. Williamson does, that no such election of individuals out of Abraham's descendants as exclusive partakers of the promised blessings could have taken place; to claim that the fact that the whole were not at first heirs, is a proof that none of them now are, is directly to contradict the administration God has exercised, and exhibit the sovereignty with which he has bestowed his gifts, as an infringement of his own promises. What an astonishing impeachment of his government, to proceed from a Presbyterian

minister! What an astounding contravention of the great doctrines of sovereignty and election in the salvation of men, to receive an emphatic approval in the quarter where this has been sanctioned! Surely, neither Mr. W. nor his friends can have comprehended the assumption on which he proceeds here, nor suspected the result to which his argument leads.

Instead, then, of having offered anything in this argument that shows that the Israelites are no longer heirs of the covenant, he has only made assumptions that are in direct conflict with the plainest teachings of the sacred word, and contradict the whole course of the divine administration, and would, if legitimate, prove that there not only are not now, but that there never have been, any heirs of the covenant.

As a second proof of his proposition, he alleges the fact that at the institution of the law at Sinai, the penalty of death was annexed to a considerable number of offences, and the perpetrators of them, thereafter cut off from Israel, by immediate execution. How the infliction of death on those individuals proves that none of the present descendants of Jacob are heirs of the covenant, Mr. W. does not show, nor is it easy to see. It surely cannot, unless it be on the principle on which he proceeds in his first argument, that none of the Israelites can be heirs of the covenant, except the whole are. How can the fact that the perpetrators of those offences were subjected to capital punishment, prove that the present and future descendants of Israel are not heirs of the covenant, unless the forfeiture of the blessings of the covenant by any of his descendants, proves their forfeiture by the whole of them; or in other words, except it be that the blessings of the covenant cannot be inherited by any of his offspring, unless they are inherited by all? But that, as we have already shown, is not only without authority from the Scriptures, but is in contradiction to their express teachings, and the whole course of God's procedure with Abraham's descendants.

Mr. Williamson, however, seems not to be aware that that is the import of the verb *to cut off*, in the laws to which he refers. He seems to regard it as denoting a mere exclusion, an excision, or an excommunication from the people of Israel; for he represents those thus cut off, as "cut off"—

not from life—but “from *the seed of Abraham* ;” and enumerates in that class, all those who “refused to hear and obey the Saviour when he came ;” who certainly were not put to death for it by their nation as malefactors. Those of them who were put to death by the hand of man, were slaughtered in insurrections, in civil war, or in war with the Romans. But far the greater part of them died a natural death, and vast numbers survived and continued in Palestine, or were carried into captivity. He has fallen, therefore, into a very extraordinary error ; for that death, not a mere excommunication, or exclusion from the people of Israel, was the penalty denoted by the term, admits of no dispute. It is seen from the following passage, in which, to be put to death, and to be cut off from the people, are used as equivalents : “Ye shall keep the Sabbath, for it is holy ; every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death ; for whosoever doeth work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people,” Ex. xxxi. 14. Mr. W. thus totally mistakes the nature of the penalty the term denotes. No such excision, in fact, or excommunication, as he imagines, was known to the Mosaic polity. A most unfortunate blunder, truly, to be made the basis of so sweeping a conclusion as he founds on it ! What unmitigated scorn, what shouts of derision would it excite, should a millenarian betray such a consummate misconception of a plain provision of the Mosaic law, and found on it a principal argument for the support of his system ! He accomplishes, then, nothing by this argument, any more than by the other, except to show with what extreme inconsideration he adopts opinions, and on what unsubstantial ground he builds his system.

As a third proof of his proposition, he alleges that the ten tribes, on their revolt to idolatry and removal to Assyria, were excised from the people of the covenant, and divested of all their title to its blessings. He says :—

“After the days of Solomon, the nation of Israel divided into two kingdoms or parties ; ten tribes followed Jeroboam the son of Nebat, while the tribe of Judah, and the few that remained of Benjamin, followed Rehoboam the son of Solomon, the rightful heir of David and of the kingdom. War ensued, and the division became permanent, the one party following the descendants of David, their king,

and the other, Jeroboam and his successors, till the opposers of the sons of David, who, as a nation, had, by their idolatry in setting up the golden calves, and refusing to go up to Jerusalem to keep the Passover, and by many other sins, *incurred the penalty of excision from the people of God*, were carried away captive by the Assyrians, and mingled among the Gentiles, till they were lost, and as a nation disowned of the Lord, and have not since been found. See 1 Kings xii. to 2 Kings xvii., especially the first and last chapters mentioned. So they are not yet all Israel which are of Israel.

"This total casting off of the ten tribes of Israel, about 350 years after Saul was made king, was threatened or foretold, 1 Kings xiv. 15, and seems to have been the legitimate penalty of the laws which they had violated as a nation, by setting up idols and departing from the true God, and marks a new era in the history of Israel. The ten tribes, however, claimed the name of Israel, the name of all before.

"This is not mere conjecture. They had violated the law, the penalty of which was *excision*; and when the Lord took the execution of it into his own hands, we are told, 2 Kings xvii. 15-21, 'They rejected his statutes, and his covenant which he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they left all the commandments of the Lord their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven. . . . Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight. There was none left but the tribe of Judah only.'

"This seems plain. All were cast out of the sight of the Lord, but the tribe of Judah only. . . . This act of *excision* was not executed until there had been abundant time for all who did not in heart fall in with the idolatry of the nation of Israel, to come out from among them and to join themselves with the tribe of Judah. This many of them did as soon as Jeroboam set up his calves, 2 Chron. xi. 13-16. . . . So that all the tribes of Israel were now represented and included in the tribe of Judah, Benjamin having before been with them. After this falling of a part of all the tribes to Judah, we find that during the good reigns of Asa and Hezekiah, many others of the ten tribes fell to Judah, which seems to justify the frequent allusion of the prophets to Israel and Judah and all the tribes after this date, and *after the nation of Israel*—the ten tribes—*were no longer counted as the covenant people of God*.

"This view seems confirmed by the fact that it is now more than 2500 years since their cutting off, and so effectual has been that casting off of them out of his sight, that they have never since been found, though great efforts have been made in searching the

whole earth to see if possible where they were settled. But they have not been found, and no wonder, for if they are cast out of the sight of the Lord, *so as to be no longer his covenant people*, they will not be seen by the eyes of men. The heirs are then now to be found only among those who are to be amalgamated with the tribe of Judah, and are generally called Jews."—Pp. 39–43.

He thus represents that the whole of those of the ten tribes who apostatized to idols and were carried into captivity were absolutely excinded, or excommunicated from the people of God, so that they were no longer heirs of the covenant promises; and alleges that that was the legitimate or specified penalty of the laws which they, as a nation, violated in setting up idols and departing from God. No misrepresentation, however, could be greater. If it is just, why did he not demonstrate it? He offers not a shadow of proof of it; nor can he. There is not a hint in the sacred word that they then suffered an excision from God's people, and ceased to be heirs of the covenant. The supposition is indeed a solecism. The covenant embraced the whole of the offspring of Jacob's twelve sons. At Sinai all were treated as its heirs, because of their descent from him. Every male of the nation was, simply as an Israelite, an inheritor of the promise of Canaan; and at its distribution accordingly to the several tribes, on their entering the land, every family received a share of it as a possession. As then it was simply as Israelites that they were heirs of the land, to suppose that on their apostasy and exile they were excinded from the chosen people and divested of their heirship, is in effect to suppose that they were excinded from Jacob's lineage, or ceased to be Israelites. But that was impossible. How could they cease to be Israelites? How could they be made of a different lineage? As then they continued to be Israelites, they still belonged to the people to whom the land was promised and given, as much as they did before their revolt and captivity. All, moreover, who continued subject to the law imposed on the nation at Sinai, undoubtedly continued to be Israelites and heirs of the land. Does Mr. Williamson imagine that the ten tribes, by their apostasy and removal into Assyria, became exempt from the jurisdiction of that law? Did they lose their relation to it, and

become free from its obligation, like the Ishmaelites or Gentiles? Did the Most High lose his peculiar rights over them that had sprung from his adopting them as his people, and lavishing on them the numerous blessings with which they were distinguished? Was not their continued idolatry after their exile as much a violation of his law as it was before? Did it not continue to render them obnoxious to the penalty? And finally, when they repented and again sought his favor, did he not treat them as still his chosen people, and heirs of the land he had given them? If so—and surely Mr. W. will not venture to deny it—then they were as much the chosen people of God and heirs of the covenant during their captivity as they were before.

Instead of the absurd and impossible penalty—excision from the Israelitish people, or a loss of their relation as offspring to Jacob—which Mr. Williamson imagines attached to their revolt; the evils which God threatened as the penalty of their rebellion, were precisely such in kind—though raised to a more awful intensity—as he was accustomed to inflict on other nations for their crimes; namely, those of famine, pestilence, plagues of every description, slaughter, the domination of powerful and remorseless tyrants, and finally exile from their country, and servitude to their enemies; and they were to be inflicted on them as his covenant people, not as on a nation that was not in that relation to him.

“But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he hath consumed thee off the land whither thou goest to possess it. The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflam-

mation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword ; and with blasting, and with mildew ; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish. And thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust ; from heaven shall it come down upon thee until thou be destroyed. The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies ; thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them ; and thou shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. And thy carcass shall be meet unto all fowls of the air, and unto the beasts of the earth, and none shall scare them away. The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart ; and thou shalt grope at noon-day, as the blind gropeth in darkness ; and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways ; and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee.

“ The Lord shall bring thee and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone ; and thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee. Thou shalt carry much seed into the field, and shalt gather but little in ; for the locust shall consume it. Thou shalt plant vineyards and dress them, but shalt neither drink of the wine, nor gather the grapes ; for the worm shall eat them. Thou shalt have olive trees throughout all thy coasts, but thou shalt not anoint thyself with the oil ; for thine olive shall cast its fruit. Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them ; for they shall go into captivity. All thy trees and fruit of thy land shall the locust consume. The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high ; and thou shalt come down very low. He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him ; he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail.

“ Moreover all these curses shall come on thee and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed ; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes, which he commanded thee. And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed forever ; because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with joyfulness and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things. Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies, which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things ; and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee. The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth as the eagle flieth ; a nation whose tongue thou

shalt not understand ; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young ; and he shall eat the fruit of thy cattle, and the fruit of thy land, until thou be destroyed ; which also shall not leave thee corn, wine, or oil, the increase of thy kine, or flocks of thy sheep, until he hath destroyed thee. And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst throughout all thy land, and thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege and in the straitness wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee.

"If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, the Lord thy God ; then the Lord shall make thy plagues wonderful ; and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sickness and of long continuance. Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of ; and they shall cleave unto thee ; and every sickness, and every plague which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed. And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude, because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God. And it shall come to pass that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you, so will the Lord rejoice over you to destroy you and to bring you to naught ; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other ; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest ; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind. . . . And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships. . . . And there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you."—Deut. xxviii. 15–68.

The evils which were made the penalty of rebellion, were thus in kind the same as those with which God punished the heathen for their idolatries, oppressions, and other crimes, and were mainly to be inflicted on the Israelites *in their own land*, while they retained their national organization. They were the deprivation, in the most distressing forms, of all the

individual, social, and national blessings which God had lavished on them, and subjection to all the personal, social, and national miseries and dishonors, with which men are ever smitten, carried to such degrees and continued through such periods, as to reduce them from a multitude to a small number. Exile from their country, and dispersion among the nations, though among the severest, was only a single and the last element of the penalty. There is no intimation that this, any more than the others, involved their excision from the chosen people, and disinheritance of their part in the covenant. Their being driven from their land no more divested them of their heirship, than it wrested from them the parentage by which they were Israelites, and transformed them into a Gentile race. Mr. Williamson might as well allege the mildews, the ravages of insects, the loss of herds and flocks, the plagues, pestilences, and famines, the fears, the sorrows, and the despair with which they were smitten and wasted, as proofs of such a metamorphosis, as their bondage to their enemies and dispersion into other lands. So far from there being the slightest ground for his representation that the loss of their heirship as Israelites was the threatened penalty of their apostasy, the whole curse contemplates them as still continuing to be God's chosen people. It was to be inflicted on them in that character, and in that alone, and was to be continued as long, and only as long, as they continued in their rebellion. And when God was to give them repentance, he was to give it to them as his people; and he was then to recognise and bless them as such, and they were to acknowledge and honor him as their covenant God. This is seen from the promise which follows the prediction of their captivity and dispersion.

“And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine

be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee. And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, which persecuted thee; and thou shalt return and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day."—Deut. xxx. 1–8.

Here is thus a specific recognition of them while in exile and suffering the extremity of the curse, as still his chosen people, and the heirs of his promises, and exhibition of himself as still the Lord their God, as absolutely as when they were residing in their own land. Otherwise the promise itself would have no validity nor meaning. If it was not made to Israelites—to God's chosen people—to the heirs of the covenant—to whom was it made? Will Mr. W. venture, in direct contradiction to its terms, to affirm that instead of them, it was addressed to a race who stood in no peculiar relation to Jehovah, and had no interest in the promised land? If not, then he must abandon the pretence that their excision from God's chosen people, and loss of their interest in their land, was a penalty assigned by the law to their rebellion.

We cannot but be surprised, that Mr. W. should have fallen into such an error. A misrepresentation more groundless, or offering a more palpable contradiction to the word of God, was never put forth by a mistaken theorist. It involves the preposterous supposition, that the Israelites on their rebellion ceased to be Israelites, or the lineal descendants of Jacob, and became a different race. It implies that they lost their relation to the law which they violated, and thence that their punishment was not a punishment of them as its violators, and, therefore, that the evils with which they were smitten, were not inflicted as *the penalty* of the law; which is against his own representation, that their imagined excision from God's people was itself that penalty. It implies that when the whole nation apostatized and was

carried into bondage, God ceased to have a covenant people, and thence that when he recalled the tribes of Judah and Benjamin from their captivity at Babylon, it was by a wholly new adoptive act that they were constituted his people.

- Will Mr. W. be good enough to point us to the record of that act? Will he inform us how we are to interpret God's procedure towards them during their exile and at their restoration, so as to make it consistent with such a new adoption? Was there a period in which there was no race, no line of descendants, that inherited the great promise of a Redeemer of the Abrahamic lineage, and of the house of David? Was the promise itself of that Redeemer made void; did a breach take place in the line of its inheritors by the apostasy of some of the kings of whom he was to descend? For several of that line were addicted to the grossest idolatry, and one was carried captive to Babylon. Such was indisputably the fact, if Mr. Williamson's representation is correct. On his view, at the period of their apostasy, there was no more a continuous line according to the promise, of the house of David, than there was of the ten tribes of Israel, or the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, at the period of their apostasy and exile; and the Redeemer, consequently, must have descended of a line of which several of the individuals were neither heirs of the promise, nor sustained any covenant relation to it. Such is the shocking result to which his representation leads. Such is the inextricable labyrinth of errors in which his assumptions involve him.

His notion that an excision of the tribes from the chosen people, and deprivation of their heirship to the land of Canaan, was the penalty of their apostasy, and was accomplished at their exile, is thus a mere figment, not only without a shadow of ground either in the law or the providence of God to support it, but against the uniform representations of his word, and the whole course of his dispensations towards them. They continued to be the subjects of the covenant and law, and inheritors of Canaan, as much when in captivity as when in possession of their land; and as much when in apostasy to idols, as when in allegiance to Jehovah: precisely as the house of David continued to be heirs and subjects of the promise that the Messiah should be of their line,

as much when individuals of the line of which he was to descend, apostatized to idolatry, as when they maintained their allegiance to God; and as much when they were in captivity and exile, as when they sat on the throne of Judah. Otherwise the promises of restoration from exile were not made to the chosen people; and those who were restored from the captivity at Babylon, were not restored as Israelites and heirs of the covenant; which is in the most open contradiction to the representations of the Scriptures; as any one may see who reads the letter sent by Jeremiah, chap. xxix., to the Israelites while in captivity at Babylon, or the prayer of Daniel, chap. ix., for their restoration—in which they are everywhere exhibited as God's chosen people.

He alleges as a further proof of his proposition, that on the coming of Christ and the institution of the church, all those Israelites who rejected him, excluded themselves by their unbelief from the chosen people, and ceased to be heirs of any of the blessings that were promised to them in the covenant. He says of Christ's teaching:

"To this the larger part of the Jewish church, as then constituted, refused to submit, declaring that he was an impostor, while another part of that people owned him as their rightful sovereign, the predicted son of David who was to reign over them; and now the division commenced under John, somewhat modified, is renewed; one party, though the smaller, again receive Christ as the Lord and King; the other saying, we will not have this man to reign over us, for we have no king but Cæsar. A war at least of persecution soon commenced, so violent that the two parties were permanently separated, as much as under Jeroboam and Rehoboam, or as Jew and Gentile, and have never since reunited, except so far as converts from those under Cæsar have come over to those on the side of Christ; and such is the nature of their different views, that no other union can be formed. Hence they are as effectually divided at this day, as they were when Christ was in the world. Keep in mind that this division was not between the Jews and Gentiles, but between the Jews themselves, as much so as that between the ten tribes and Judah; and such a division that *the one party only could be the lawful heirs of the promises made to Abraham and David.* Which, then, of these two parties, were the true successors and lawful heirs? Were those Jews who rejected the Saviour, and said, 'We have no king but Cæsar,' the lawful heirs? Or those Jews who believed in and

received Christ as the true Messiah, their rightful sovereign, the predicted King of the Jews, the son of David? *Which of these parties forfeited their inheritance, as Esau did by selling his birth-right?*"

"Did those Jews who received him as their promised Saviour, and who carefully followed and obeyed him, though often at great sacrifices, thereby forfeit their character as Jews, and their claim as heirs to the promises made to Abraham and his seed; and did the other party who called him an impostor, and who joined in persecuting and putting to death the Son of God, thereby secure to themselves and their children for ever all those rich legacies which were yet due by covenant promise to the lawful heirs of Abraham? Can you suppose that the forfeiture fell upon that party, though for the present the smaller, who obeyed the Saviour, and owned him as their promised deliverer; and that the party who rejected him as an impostor, and continued to rebel against him after his resurrection, *by that rebellion secured to themselves and their children* these rich legacies from that very Saviour who has bequeathed these legacies, and who has risen to be the executor of his own will? Would not this be rather a strange conclusion? That such an act of rebellion against their rightful sovereign, should be followed by such rich blessings, and that the obedience and love of the disciples of Christ and the thousands of others who, during the preaching of the apostles, fell to him and owned him as their Saviour, should be followed by such fearful forfeiture to themselves and their children! At least this is not the way in which victors commonly reward their friends and enemies, and you can hardly maintain that Christ will really so reward his friends and enemies; *and yet such was the nature of that division, that you will admit that both parties could not after this be the heirs of all the rich legacies yet due to the lawful heirs of Abraham*, for they were even more diverse than Jew and Gentile."—1p. 51-55.

* A more unhappy confusion of ideas, a sadder misconception of a plain subject, we have seldom seen. He proceeds on the assumption that it was altogether impossible that the Israelites as a body, whether believers in Christ or not, could, in virtue of their relationship to Abraham, continue heirs of the great promise of a perpetual national existence, and inheritance of the land of Canaan. He imagines that if those who believed continued to be heirs of that promise, those who rejected Christ could not: and that if those who rejected him continued to be heirs, those who believed on him could not. That such was the fact, however, he gives not the slightest

evidence. But he throughout confounds a participation in the *spiritual* blessings—renovation, pardon, acceptance, and eternal life—bestowed by Christ on believers, with an interest in the promise to the Israelites of a perpetual national existence and inheritance of the land of Canaan; imagines that they necessarily go together; and implies, as we have already shown, that Gentiles by their faith, become heirs of the promised land, and are at length to be put in possession of it as their everlasting abode. No fancy, however, could be more wholly unwarranted. That land was given to the Israelites simply as the chosen people of God; the descendants of Jacob: precisely as a perpetual national existence was promised to them as his offspring, and God's people. Their being sanctified and exercising the faith of Abraham, was not a condition of their being heirs of the land, and put in possession of it. Does Mr. Williamson imagine that the whole body of those who were heirs of it, and who in fact had a possession in it, were sanctified, and were the children of Abraham by faith, as well as by lineage? Does he deny that they were God's chosen people, and heirs of Canaan, simply as Israelites, without any consideration whether they were believers or not? If not; if a multitude of those who were inheritors of it, and occupied it till they were conquered by the Romans—were unbelievers, how can Mr. Williamson maintain that the rejectors of Christ disinherited themselves by their unbelief, and lost all their interest in the promises that were peculiar to that people, of a covenant relation to God, a perpetual national existence, and the inheritance of Canaan? If unbelief did not draw after it an excision from the chosen people, and disinheritance of the covenant during the time of the Judges and the Kings, why did it any more during the domination of the Romans? In what an extraordinary complexity of contradictions and absurdities Mr. W. has involved himself! If he maintains that those who rejected Christ lost their heirship to the covenant because of their unbelief, and on the ground that it was necessary that they should be the children of Abraham by faith, in order to be inheritors of the national blessings promised his chosen descendants; then he must maintain that the whole body of those who belonged to the nation, and had a possession in the sacred land from the time

of their entrance on it till their final dispersion, were genuine believers. But that will be to deny that any of them ever apostatized from God, and contradict the pretence he is endeavoring to sustain, that they were carried into captivity, because they had, as idolators, excised themselves from the chosen people, and lost their title to all the national blessings that were promised in the covenant. If he admits that faith was not a necessary condition of heirship to those national blessings, then he gives up the ground on which he maintains that those who rejected Christ lost their interest in the national inheritance, and ceased to belong to the chosen people. And finally, if he holds that faith gave a title to that inheritance, and that all who believed in Christ became thereby fellow-heirs with the chosen people, and sharers in their national domain, then he must maintain that all the Gentile believers became inheritors of the land of Canaan, and are to receive a portion there for their everlasting residence. What a charming complication of errors, self-contradictions, and monstrosities! Such is the issue of his attempt to foist a doctrine into the word of God, which is not only unknown to it, but in palpable contravention of its most indubitable teachings;—of his endeavor to annex a penalty to the Mosaic law, which God has not annexed to it; and to rescind a covenant and abolish an inheritance which God has declared shall be perpetual. Not a particle of proof does he allege to support his extraordinary theory; not the slightest endeavor does he make to reconcile it to the numerous passages of the divine word, which it contradicts; not a solitary effort to protect himself from the fatal results, to which a glance, we should have supposed, would have shown him, it inevitably leads! His mere opinion, and that not directly stated and boldly affirmed, but veiled under insinuations and queries, and artfully urged by hints and representations that the only alternative to its acceptance is, an assent to views that are at variance with the Scriptures and religion—is all he offers for its support.

Thus far, then, Mr. Williamson has wholly failed in his object. The notion he advances is a figment unknown to the word of God, in contradiction to its most indubitable teachings, and irreconcilable with any of the great measures of the divine administration, which it professes to explain.

The discussions with which he occupies the remainder of

his volume, are marked by similar superficialities and misconceptions; but our readers will probably think the exhibition we have already made of them is enough for one occasion, and will acquiesce in our postponing a further notice of his work to a future number.

ART. VII.—THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NAPOLEON DYNASTY.

THE eyes of the world are at present turned in surprise and apprehension to the change through which France is passing. The spectacle is well adapted to excite astonishment. No event could a few years ago have been deemed more improbable than that one of the Bonaparte family should again grasp the imperial sceptre, and possess himself of more than the absolute power of the first Napoleon. Nothing could have been thought more unlikely than that he should accomplish it without having previously achieved any great act to give *éclat* to his name, without a contest with the Bourbon dynasty, and without remonstrance from any of the neighboring monarchies. It was against the policy of the great powers that drove the first emperor from his throne, and reinstated the Bourbons in their ancient heritage. It was against the wishes and aims of the French people, which were openly directed to the acquisition of a greater share in the administration of the government, and the restriction of the powers of the monarchy within narrower limits. It was against all the appearances presented by the Bonapartes themselves; as there was no one of their number who seemed possessed of talents that could render such an achievement possible. Yet notwithstanding these apparently insuperable obstacles, owing to an extraordinary conjunction of circumstances, Louis Napoleon has accomplished it by his mere will. He formed the plan. He fixed the moment of its execution. He carried it into effect. He struck the republic from existence by his mere fiat, and reproduced the empire; and conducted the movement with such adroitness, that the nation voluntarily, and with seem-

ing enthusiasm, surrendered itself without reserve to his absolute will. Not a solitary step in the extraordinary revolution appears to have been suggested, or directed by any other intellect than his. Not a solitary individual of the train of statesmen, legislators, and warriors, who have had a share in it, seems to have acted any other part than that of a mere executor of his dictum. The power he now holds is greater than was ever before possessed by a French monarch. He is the absolute master of the liberty, the property, and the life of every one of his subjects. No restraint is imposed on him by the constitution he substituted for that of the republic, or by the *Senatus consultum*. They merely define in a brief way the mode in which he is to do whatever he pleases; and the *Sénate* and people are to do or suffer whatever he requires. He can dictate any new laws that he chooses. He can suspend or annul any of the ancient statutes that are yet in force. He can confiscate any property and levy any taxes that he will. He can seize and consign to prison, exile, or death, whomsoever he pleases. He has the absolute disposal of the public revenue. He can give and take away office. He can create a nobility. He is the master of the army, and can augment or diminish it at his pleasure; can levy war as he wills; and to accomplish the objects of his ambition, can lead forth the youth of the empire in any number he pleases, to be slaughtered on the plains of Italy and Germany, or on the shores of Britain. A more despotic sceptre was never held by a monarch; and seldom has a wider theatre been opened, to one for good or ill. Who can contemplate the astonishing spectacle without feeling that it is to give birth to some great result?

What, then, is the course which the new emperor, flushed with his success thus far, is likely to pursue? Should he desert the example of his uncle, whom he has hitherto aimed to resemble, and cherish the pacific policy which he promises, he may prove a deliverer and benefactor to France. But little reliance, we apprehend, is to be placed on his benevolent professions. If in a measure sincere, it is far from being certain that events will not drive him into collision with his neighbors. Neither the condition of the nations, nor the predictions of the Scriptures, warrant the expectation that Europe is to enjoy any long season of repose. Even if an

open war is avoided, the great strife between the despots and the friends of freedom, and between the apostate church and the true worshippers, is to go on, advance to greater energy, and at length issue in a persecution of the witnesses for Jesus; and in that great struggle France is undoubtedly to take a conspicuous part on the side of the papacy, as she has heretofore at every stage of the war waged by that power against the rights of God and his worshippers. It was Clovis, one of her monarchs, who, thirteen centuries and a half ago, first professed the Catholic faith; first gave the church in his dominions a national establishment; and first enriched it with lands and revenues. It was Pepin and Charlemagne, monarchs of that empire, who constituted the Pope a political prince, by investing him with the civil dominion of Rome and the states that were connected with it. It was Charlemagne who, by receiving his crown from the hands of Leo III., gave occasion to the assumption by the Popes of the power to dispose of the crowns of all other monarchs. It was by the nobles and ecclesiastics of the south of France that those martyred there in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were put to death. It was by them, at the instigation of Innocent III., that the war of extermination was waged in the beginning of the thirteenth century on the Albigenses, and nearly the whole of that numerous people swept to the grave. It was by the kings of France that the Protestants were persecuted from the early years of the reformation to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, when, it is estimated, 60,000 to 70,000 of them were slain. It was by a king of France that the edict of Nantes, granting them toleration, was revoked, and after great numbers had been destroyed by cruel deprivations and brutal outrages, a half million of them were driven from the kingdom to find a home in Germany, England, and this country. And it was by Louis Napoleon himself that the Pope was lately re-established on his throne at Rome; and it is under his auspices that the hierarchy of France is rapidly recovering much of its ancient power, and cherishing the hope of again extending its sway over the whole population.

She has thus, through a long series of ages, acted a more important part than any other member of the great anti-christian confederacy in the support of the Papacy and the

war on the saints; and she is doubtless to exert an equally conspicuous and efficient agency in the fiercer contests which still await the faithful witnesses for Jesus and the word of God. Should the new emperor, therefore, for the present pursue a peaceful policy, his intimate relations to the Pope, the necessity he is likely to feel of conciliating the support of the Catholic priesthood, and his despotic instincts, it may justly be believed will naturally lead him to repress the religious freedom of his subjects, and wish and endeavor to stifle the voice of those teachers who preach the gospel which proclaims the speedy downfall of the Catholic hierarchies, and the overthrow of the civil powers by which they are upheld: and whatever may be his aims, his measures will certainly be such as will lead on to the commotions and catastrophes by which, the voice of inspiration assures us, the anti-christian governments are ere long to be swept to destruction. And in those terrible judgments, France is undoubtedly to have a large share. Her princes have been the head, as it were, of the great anti-christian power through every age of its tyrannous career. They have persecuted the people of God for a longer period, and on a greater scale, than any other European monarchy; and a greater number of martyrs lie buried beneath her soil than slumber within the limits of any other kingdom. As she has thus been distinguished for her crimes, so her punishments are to be eminently great; and the despot to whom she has now surrendered herself, whatever plans he may pursue, is doubtless to be the means of preparing the way for their infliction.

That he is designing a peaceful policy, however, is very far from being certain. His protestations give no assurance of it. His ambition of equalling the first Napoleon in fame, as well as power, the passion of the nation for military glory, and the necessity he is to be under of giving active employment to the army, and unfolding to its aspiring chiefs an opportunity to distinguish themselves, and gain a place among the new nobility, indicate that he will rather seek than avoid an occasion for war; and make it certain that he will not shun a contest when it either promises his aggrandizement, is demanded by the voice of the nation, or is required for his safety.

On the supposition, then, that he is either prompted by a

desire of conquest, or forced by circumstances to engage in war, in what direction will he be likely to turn? What policy will he probably pursue? And what results may be expected to spring from his success?

It seems to be thought by many that his first effort may very naturally be to re-incorporate Belgium with the empire; and that he may not improbably accomplish it through the influence of the Catholic priests and an invitation, perhaps, from a part of the population, without a rupture with the neighboring governments. Should he achieve that, however, either by intrigue, diplomacy, or force, if ambitious of the glory of a conqueror, he will not be likely to limit his wishes to so narrow an acquisition. To possess himself of the field of Waterloo, will not be to raise himself to the rank of the warrior who there lost his crown.

Should he then endeavor to extend his dominion beyond the Rhine, or to possess himself of Italy, it would inevitably draw on a general war, and give birth to momentous consequences. Were he to venture on such an undertaking, he would probably imitate the generals of the revolution, who endeavored to draw the nations whom they invaded to their side, by the promise of a release from the tyrannies by which they were crushed, and the gift of a free and equitable government; and such a proclamation in Italy, supported by the presence of a large army, would instantly paralyse, there is reason to believe, the governments of Rome, Tuscany, and Naples. Hollow and worthless as the pledge might be, the population very generally of southern Italy would undoubtedly welcome it, and rally to his standard, and leave the despots under whom they are now groaning, to the necessity of instant flight or submission. To what stupendous results would such a revolution lead! Though he might choose to preserve to the Pope the semblance, at least, of his civil power, it would scarcely fail to weaken his hold of his own subjects, as well as of those of other empires; and the moment of the transition to the new rule, would doubtless be to multitudes in the Roman States, as well as in Naples and Tuscany, one of license and revenge, in which they would wreak their hoarded resentment, on the priests especially, and other officials, by whom they have so long been pursued and trampled down. If the

opinions of those who have lately resided in Italy are reliable, assassination, on a vast scale, of those objects of their hatred, will inevitably attend the next revolution in that country.

And such would be the consequence also, probably, were he to invade Germany. The next great conflict in which that country is involved, if brought on by a foreign power that promises freedom to the people, will almost inevitably give birth to revolutions, in which they will array themselves against each other, and the knife of the assassin, and the arms of the mob, will consign to destruction vast crowds of those who have rendered themselves objects of their dislike. While, indeed, the present exasperation of the population against their rulers and priests continues, wars of invasion in any part of southern or central Europe, from whatever quarter they may come, will, almost of necessity, be attended by domestic revolutions and contests, that will spread death and devastation in every direction. Cities will be sacked, palaces and temples fired, the dwellings of the noble and wealthy consigned to pillage, and their tenants outraged and murdered. The rage of the multitude who have so often been cheated and foiled, will, at the first moment of fresh excitement and license, break from restraint, and wreak itself on those whom they regard as the authors of their misfortunes. Such a conflict, then, whatever its final issue may be, may justly be expected to be more dreadful than any of which those countries, though so often drenched in blood, have hitherto been the scene; and the result, whichever way the scale may turn, can scarcely fail to be unfriendly to both political and religious liberty. If success attends Louis Napoleon, it will issue in the subjection of the conquered nations to a despotism like that which he now exerts over France; while the more open alienation of crowds from the church, may induce him to arm the hierarchies with a higher coercive power. Should he, on the other hand, fall, it may naturally lead to the re-establishment of a Bourbon on the throne, who will naturally be the tool of the Jesuits, and devote his power to the advancement of their ruthless schemes of aggrandizement and tyranny.

Abroad, however, it seems to be thought far more probable that if Louis Napoleon attempts to signalize himself in

war, it will be by an onset on Great Britain. The English papers are filled with speculations on the subject, and the Government itself deems it so possible, that measures are taken on a large scale to guard against it. An additional land force is enlisted. The navy is to be more fully manned. The engines of war are preparing; the ports are put in a better state of defence.

Though, fifty years ago, the project of invading England was little less than absurd, it is now regarded as very far from impracticable. Its chief difficulty then lay in the passage of the Channel. A concurrence of favorable circumstances was then requisite to the safe conveyance of an army to the British shore, which the lapse of years perhaps might not present. Nineteen attempts out of twenty, not improbably ninety-nine out of a hundred, would almost infallibly have been defeated, by calms, adverse winds, tempests, or by the vigilance and power of the British fleet. The use of steam in the navigation of war vessels, removes in a great measure all those obstacles, except the last. The passage might now be made from several French ports, in from three to six hours, and as well in the night as the day, and in a calm or with a head wind, as with a favorable breeze. A half dozen fleets starting in concert from different points, might very possibly cross and effect a landing, ere the British squadrons, if at a considerable distance, could interpose in sufficient force to intercept them. If the attempt, then, is now to be defeated, it is to be, not improbably, at the point of landing, rather than on the water, and by the army rather than the navy.

Such an event, then, cannot be considered as altogether impossible; nor, from the great principles on which God conducts his providence over nations, is it improbable. Wars—and wars in which all the evils of slaughter, defeat, conquest, rapine, and devastation are suffered—are among the great and most signal of the plagues with which he scourges those especially who are guilty of inflicting similar evils on others. Such has been the retribution hitherto of every warlike and conquering people. The seat of every great kingdom of Asia, northern Africa, and the continent of Europe, has been the scene of invasion, slaughter, pillage, and the waste of life and destruction of property, by every

species of violence, on a terrific scale. Every capital has been sacked, every scene of cultivation and wealth strewn with ruin, every empire drenched with the blood of its inhabitants. From these terrible calamities, England has enjoyed an extraordinary exemption. Her wars have been chiefly foreign, and waged for her own aggrandizement. No hostile power has invaded her shores for near eight hundred years. The blood that has been shed on her soil in that period, has been shed by her own hand in the contests of different parties for the possession of the government. Who can tell but that her hour of retribution is still to come—but that the horrors she has so often inflicted on others, and especially on the helpless nations over whom she has extended her empire, are yet to be suffered, at least in a measure, by herself?

That Great Britain is to be conquered, and struck from the list of independent kingdoms, no one will deem probable. Such a triumph is not within the scope of France, nor would its permission consist with the policy of the other great powers on the continent. An onset, however, might not impossibly be made on her, that would put her in jeopardy, and place her under a necessity, as a condition of peace, of conforming her civil and religious policy more nearly to that which prevails in the Catholic kingdoms; and the infliction by France of such a blow, might meet the approval of Russia, Austria, and Rome. A single brilliant victory, a conquest of the capital, a compulsion of the government to nationalize the Catholic hierarchy, and the dictation of a costly peace, might perhaps satisfy the ambition of Louis Napoleon. But such a stroke would give birth to stupendous results, and cannot be contemplated without awe and dread. There is no other great empire whose fall, even to the rank of a second-rate kingdom, would carry such effects to every other part of the world. A serious diminution of her power would naturally lead to the independence of all her great colonies, Canada, the Cape of Good Hope, India, and Australia. An interruption of her foreign commerce for any considerable period, would almost necessarily transfer it, in a large measure, in perpetuity to other hands. But the consequences that would spring from the investiture of the Catholic priesthood, by nationalization, with the power which

they covet, an attempt to subject the population generally to their sway, and a restriction of the liberty of the press, would give birth to effects of infinitely greater moment. Such measures would naturally generate internal dissensions and strifes that would weaken her power, and threaten her stability more seriously even than any foreign losses. A coalition between the present establishment and the Catholic church, or the elevation of the latter to a position in which it could exert a decisive influence over the government, and employ its vast power in the spread and enforcement of its doctrines, would not only breed insurrection and drive the Evangelical from the Protestant establishment, but would probably induce such multitudes to migrate to this and other countries, where they might hope to enjoy civil and religious liberty, as to inflict a fatal blow on her prosperity, and yield to the anti-christian party an easy triumph over the friends of freedom who should remain behind. That England is in fact to be the scene of another persecution of the true worshippers, there seems no reason to doubt. There is no intimation that the monarchies of the whole of the ten kingdoms are not represented by the beast of ten horns, at the epoch at which the witnesses are to be slain by it; and that seems to indicate that England, which is one of the number, is then to be in the interest of the Papacy. Who can contemplate these extraordinary and portentous changes without dismay!

Our readers, however, will not regard us as expressing a persuasion that either of the great lines of events which we have depicted, is certainly to take place. Our object is rather to state what the schemes are, which abroad it seems to be very generally thought Louis Napoleon is likely to pursue; and to show that, whatever measures he adopts, results of great moment are sure to follow in his train; and that not improbably, they may be such as have never been exceeded in interest and importance, both to Europe and the world.

ART. VIII.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. **MEMOIRS OF ROBERT HALDANE AND JAMES ALEXANDER HALDANE.**
By Alexander Haldane, Esq. New York: R. Carter & Brothers.
1853.

WHEN a church that has sunk into lukewarmness, or fallen into great errors, is to be revived, and an important reformation accomplished, persons peculiarly fitted by their endowments and training to work such a change, are usually raised up and made its instruments. Such were Wickliffe, Jerome of Prague, and Huss. Such were Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and Knox; such were Wesley, Whitfield, and Edwards. Though they were in a measure made what they were, by the conditions in which they lived, yet none in any considerable degree like them, have appeared on the theatre of the world since, nor any that could have filled their places. They were as peculiar in their great intellectual characteristics, as they were in the agencies they exerted; and each of them stamped his own distinctive features on the vast train who became his followers. Such also, in their spheres—a narrow one, indeed, compared to those which were filled by the illustrious individuals we have named—were the excellent men whose memoirs are detailed in this volume. Though not eminent for talents, nor fitted for that species of agency that was exerted by Calvin and Edwards, they were admirably qualified by their strong practical sense, courage, energy, fervor, dignity, prudence, and perseverance, for the scene in which they were called to labor, and the reformation they were the means of accomplishing. The church of Scotland had, towards the close of the last century, lost in a large degree the high characteristics that had distinguished it during the long period of its persecutions; the great doctrines of redemption once proclaimed with so much emphasis and fervor, had fallen into much neglect, and by many been rejected; and a religion of mere morals and forms had taken the place of a living piety. At that crisis, these men, who were bred for the navy, and spent several years on the sea, were arrested by the Spirit of God, and led, in consequence of the great change wrought in their views and tastes, to relinquish that profession, and at length to devote themselves to the spread of the gospel. James, the younger, spent a part of several years in traversing the north of Scotland, and the Shetland and Orkney Isles, and preaching the great doctrines of redemption, usually in the open air, to crowds that gathered to hear him. And his labors were attended with signal success. Great num-

bers were converted, churches that had sunk into languor were revived, and ministers were roused to a more discriminating and emphatic inculcation of the truth. He at length became the pastor of a church in Edinburgh, that had been formed under the auspices of his brother, and continued to labor there with eminent diligence and success to the close of his life. Robert, the elder, acted an equally conspicuous and influential part in a different sphere. Inheriting an ample fortune, he devoted his means with a noble liberality to the promotion of religious and charitable objects, and especially to the preparation of young men for the ministry, for which he instituted a school at Edinburgh and at Gosport, where nearly three hundred were educated, and to the erection of edifices for the new congregations that were formed in consequence chiefly of his brother's and their labors. He devoted himself assiduously, also, to his own cultivation, and became qualified by his intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, and the skill with which he wielded his pen, to act with effect on the public through the press. In 1816, he went to the continent, and spent a considerable time at Geneva and Montauban, where he became the means of leading a number of the young men who were pursuing the study of theology there, to the knowledge of the great doctrines of Christ's expiation, justification by faith in his blood, regeneration by the Spirit, and other kindred truths, and led the way, thereby, to the establishment of the evangelical schools now flourishing there, from which the pastors have proceeded who are rekindling the light of the gospel in many districts of France, where it had long been extinguished.

After his return from the continent, he took a conspicuous and influential part in the controversy which agitated Scotland especially, respecting the publication by the Bible Society of the Apocrypha with the sacred canon; and published a work on the evidences of Christianity, which received a large circulation; a work on the inspiration of the Scriptures, which is among the best on the subject; and a commentary on the Romans, which is held in esteem. After having thus labored with eminent judgment, fidelity, and success in their several fields, the elder closed his life at his seventy-ninth, and the younger at his eighty-third year.

The volume is of unusual interest, and deserves an attentive study by the ministers of the gospel especially, and candidates for the sacred office, both for the force and dignity of the characters which it delineates, and the exemplifications it presents of the methods which God takes to call his chosen people into his kingdom, and the blessings with which he crowns the faithful preaching of the great doctrines of redemption.

2. **THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES ; a Review of the Theories of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, Rev. Dr. Pye Smith, and the Rev. Dr. Dick ; and other Treatises.** By Alexander Carson, LL.D. New York : Edward Fletcher. 1853.

THE questions whether the Scriptures are inspired ; and if so, what the nature of their inspiration is ; are among the most essential that have ever been agitated in the church ; and have of late years acquired a fresh importance from the mistaken views that have been advanced in respect to them, and the disposition that now extensively prevails, to regard the Bible as in no higher sense the word of God, than any other works of poets, sages, or orators, that bear the marks of a superior genius. Those who reject its inspiration, usually, and as a matter of necessity, reduce its authority to a level with their own opinions, and make their speculative notions the medium through which they contemplate its narratives of extraordinary events, and its doctrinal teachings, and the mould into which they endeavor to cast its meaning. There is, in fact, no consistent medium between the reception of the Bible as absolutely the word of God, in its language as well as its thoughts, and the naturalism of Morell, who regards himself as much inspired, especially in his moments of superior illumination, as Isaiah or Paul were. This view of the absolute inspiration of the Scriptures is held by Dr. Carson, and sustained by a copiousness of reasons and force of logic, that few writers are capable of displaying. His criticisms, especially of Messrs. Wilson and Smith, are marked by uncommon keenness of discrimination. Of the latter writer he formed a just estimate, as deficient in penetration, easily led away by novel and specious theories, and ambitious of mingling in the discussions of the learned on subjects of which, though he had a large knowledge of books, he was but very imperfectly master. We wish this volume may be widely circulated. It should be studied especially by those of every rank who assume the office of religious teachers, and will be read with interest and instruction by the intelligent and considerate of all classes.

3. **OUTLINES OF MORAL SCIENCE.** By Archibald Alexander, D.D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. New York : Charles Scribner. 1852.

THERE is no subject in the investigation of which the narrow limits within which our powers are circumscribed, and the uncertainty of our judgments, have been more strikingly exemplified, than the mind itself. It would seem natural to suppose that the processes that

take place within us of which we are conscious, would be more easily and thoroughly understood by us than anything else:—that respecting the grounds, nature, and relations of the acts of perception, judgment, emotion, affection, and volition, with which the attention is continually occupied, and that arise in so great a variety of circumstances, and are repeated so many myriads and millions of times, no room could remain for mistake or uncertainty. Yet, in fact, there is no theme in respect to which a greater diversity of theories has been framed, or in regard to which men have fallen into more extraordinary and dangerous mistakes. This is especially true of the notions that have been held in respect to our moral nature. There is no branch of knowledge the history of which more strongly demonstrates the necessity to us of a divine revelation in order to give us assurance of the truth on subjects that apparently lie most adequately within the sphere of our unassisted powers.

This volume is the work of a mind excellently fitted for the task of stating the great elements of moral science, by clear perception, sound judgment, facility in analysing the operations of the mind, and large reading and observation; and it presents an uncommonly simple, intelligible, and just view of the great outlines of the subject. The topics are presented in a natural order; the definitions are concise and perspicuous; suitable illustrations are given; and the answers to sceptics and other objectors are acute and effective. He holds that the mind has all the faculties that are requisite to constitute it a moral agent; that conscience is a distinct and original power or susceptibility; and that there is an inherent difference between good and evil actions. He rejects the theories, accordingly, of Clarke, Wollaston, Edwards, Smith, and Paley, respecting the foundation of virtue, and confutes their errors. He discards the theory of a self-determined will, and shows that the mind puts forth its volitions for reasons of which it is conscious. He points out the fact also, which is much overlooked by speculatists, that a large share of the voluntary acts, are mere acts of thought and exercises of affection, as in study, reflection, contemplation, invention, and revery, in disconnexion with any external agency. The number of topics treated in so brief a space is very great, and they are exhibited with a completeness, perspicuity, and ease, that render them intelligible, and invest them with interest to readers of all classes.

4. ANCIENT EGYPT UNDER THE PHARAONS. By John Kenrick, M.A.
In two volumes. Redfield: New York. 1852.

It is a remarkable fact, that the only nations that have, at their ori-

gin, possessed a knowledge of the arts and a high degree of civilization, are those that first rose into power after the deluge. Those of a later period appear to have begun in a rude and barbarous state, and such of them as became civilized, drew their knowledge of the arts and of letters from the more ancient that were already in possession of them. No instance, at least, is known within the last three thousand years, of a people's rising, by their own unaided exertions, from a state of rudeness to a high grade of cultivation and refinement; nor, were all who now dwell in the circuit of the Christian world struck from life, is there any reason to suppose that the remaining population of Africa, of Northern Asia, the northern and southern extremes of this continent, and the islands of the Pacific and Indian Oceans, would ever emerge from their present debased condition. The first nations, however, appear, at the earliest date to which they can be traced, to have been as familiar with the arts, and to have reached as high a measure of cultivation, as at several centuries later. The Egyptians and the Phœnicians, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia and of Hindostan, were in possession, to all appearance, at their origin, of a great variety of useful inventions, and had as large a knowledge of letters, of mechanics, of chemistry, of husbandry, and of architecture, and as settled a civil polity, as a half dozen centuries afterwards. How is this to be accounted for, unless they drew their arts, learning, and civil institutions from their ancestors beyond the flood?

These volumes present a very accurate, comprehensive, and interesting view of the character, polity, arts, monuments, and history of the most remarkable of those first nations, the Egyptians. The author first depicts the geography of Egypt, its climate, soil, and productions, and the sites and remains of the ancient cities; next, the people and language, their agricultural, mechanical, commercial, and warlike pursuits; their life, manners, and dress; their fine arts, their letters, and science; their religious doctrines and rites; their modes of sepulture, and finally their civil polity and history, down to the era of the Ptolemies in the third century before Christ; and they are treated with excellent judgment. Mr. Kenrick indulges in none of the rash assumptions and crude declamation which have defaced the pages of many who have written, especially on the arts and the chronology of that people. He is never superficial. He makes himself master of all the questions he discusses, forms his opinions with caution, and expresses them with modesty. His style is perspicuous and neat; his descriptions sufficiently full, and his narrative clear and rapid. These are high merits; and they render his work better adapted to yield the reader the information and entertainment he

seeks in such a history, than any other with which we are acquainted.

3. ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY EXEMPLIFIED in the Private, Domestic, Social, and Civil Life of the Primitive Christians, and in the Institutions, Offices, Ordinances, and Rites of the Church. By Lyman Coleman. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1852.

THE efforts that are now making to lead the Protestant churches to adopt the unscriptural organization, the false doctrines, and the superstitious worship of the Romish communion, under the pretence that they were elements of Christianity in its original form, and were transmitted from the apostolic age, render it peculiarly important that both ministers and private members of the evangelical denominations should make themselves acquainted with the genuine faith, manners, usages, and worship of the primitive church, and the nature and causes of the innovations introduced from time to time, that finally issued in the tyrannies, corruptions, and apostasy of the Greek and Roman hierarchies. No one without this intimate knowledge, drawn from the monuments that survive of those early ages, can appreciate the enormity of the pretence that the Catholic caricature of Christianity is its original form; or see how the doctrine with which the modern Romanizers begin,—that the fathers of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries are to be taken as authoritative expositors of the New Testament; and the notions and practices which they sanctioned, be considered as transmitted from the apostles, —naturally and necessarily leads to the adoption of the errors, superstitions, and idolatries that now form the great features of the Romish religion. This volume furnishes that information. Dr. Coleman has made himself thoroughly familiar with the subject; and presents a minute and vivid picture of the characteristics of the Christians of the first ages in their domestic, religious, and civil relations; of the original constitution of the churches, and the changes that were soon wrought in their organization; of the order, prerogatives, and manners of the clergy; of their worship, sacraments, rites, ceremonies, and discipline; of their edifices and sacred places; their usages in respect to marriage, festivals, and the burial of the dead; and the various false notions, superstitions, and debasing practices with which they at length became infected. Every topic of moment within the wide compass of these subjects is treated by him with sufficient fulness, and his statements are sustained by the most ample authorities. The work is not only eminently adapted to the use of

those in the sacred office; but the variety, particularity, and novelty, in many instances, of the information it contains, and the ease and spirit with which it is detailed, will render it far more interesting and instructive to readers generally, than ordinary church histories.

6. HISTORY OF PROVIDENCE, as Manifested in Scripture; or, Facts from Scripture illustrative of the Government of God. By Alexander Carson, LL.D. New York: Edward Fletcher. 1852.

THE author details a great series of events recorded in the Old and New Testaments, in the direction of which the hand of God appeared conspicuously, for the purpose of exemplifying the sway he exerts over all the occurrences of life; the means by which he tries and delivers his people; and the mode in which he employs the agency of his creatures to accomplish his purposes. The articles, short and spirited, abound with acute and striking remarks, and are adapted to leave a deep impression of the universality, wisdom, and graciousness of God's providence, and the certainty that all the great futurities he has revealed are to meet a full accomplishment at their proper time.

7. DAUGHTERS OF CHINA; or, Sketches of Domestic Life in the Celestial Empire. By Eliza J. Gillett Bridgman. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1853.

THIS is a highly interesting narrative of incidents that occurred during five or six years of Mrs. Bridgman's residence in China as a missionary; giving many details of the condition and manners of Chinese women especially; and indicating a hopeful prospect that many of them may be brought at length to the knowledge and reception of the gospel.

THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

VOLUME V.

APRIL, 1853.

NUMBER IV.

ART. I.—THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN CALVIN, translated from the German of PAUL HENRY, D.D. By Henry Stebbins, D.D., F.R.S. In two volumes. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

BY R. W. DICKINSON, D.D.

WE confess an emotion of pity for any one who has not yet been able to decide whether the Reformation was a blessing or curse to the world. But very differently do we regard those (and they are not a few) who presume to sit in judgment on the actors in the Reformation, without having duly acquainted themselves with the facts in their history. It is discreditable not to have some information respecting that period; and it is easier to fall in with current notions than to search authentic documents, and form an enlightened judgment. There are men, too, who hug their prejudices, and would rather side with the interests of sect, than institute an impartial inquiry for themselves, or do justice to the illustrious leaders of the Reformation. Some minds, moreover, are so hedged round by ghostly traditions; so penfolded in their own ecclesiastical inclosure, that they never look beyond to the general interest of the church, and

of course dogmatically discourage all inquiries which might possibly disturb their bigoted self-complacency.

It has been supposed that we are in a more favorable position for accurately ascertaining, and candidly weighing, and justly settling the character and claims, the merits and demerits of those whose united labors resulted in the Reformation of the church. This is true to a certain extent; but not in relation to the most conspicuous Reformers—those whose names are respectively associated with our different church organizations. The same conflicting interests which served to warp the judgment of a past age in relation to such men as Luther and Calvin, Cranmer and Knox, still exist to a greater or less degree, between different denominations of Christians; and nothing short of the same spirit that actuated the Reformers themselves, can lead us to feel towards them as they felt towards one another. Greatly more just were they to each other than the modern representatives of their views are to their respective characters. Though occupying different fields of labor, well did they know one another; and having the same great interest alike at heart, most intimate and endearing was their Christian fellowship. But we, in consequence of conflicting denominational interests, have in general failed to acquaint ourselves with them, except so far as the authority of their names may in turn be rendered subservient to our opposing sectarian ends. Had we a more intimate acquaintance with the master spirits of that eventful era, we should more truly sympathize with them in their toils and trials; or did we ourselves only feel more for the honor of Christ and the interests of his church, we should be more discriminating in our judgments of men who amid the flames of persecution bore witness to the truth. Instead of rejecting their conclusions, we should weigh well their reasons; instead of magnifying their errors, celebrate their virtues; and instead of censuring them for any hasty word, or violent expression that may have escaped their lips, *praise God* that they were neither exasperated to madness, nor terrified into apostasy. How, indeed, can we rise to an adequate judgment of those who then did battle for truth against a world in arms to maintain the supremacy of error; we, who have no one to molest or to make us afraid; we, in whose hearts the love of truth burns so feebly that all our

efforts to advance Christ's cause are but fitful and faint; we, who can form but little conception of the heroism of those times, when men could prefer being thrown headlong from a lofty tower rather than kiss the cross, and even tender women submit to all the tortures of the rack, and the agonies of the stake, rather than forswear Christ.

The history of the Reformation should be studied with a disposition not unlike that which we bring to the study of God's word; for it is, in fact, the history of God's providence. If his word be read with either a prejudiced or a sceptical mind, what will be the result but the adoption of perverted views, or the rejection of the truth? And so in relation to the history of the Reformation; if we cannot rid ourselves of our sectarian biases, and of our disbelief in God's providence, we shall rise from its perusal neither better nor wiser men; prepared neither to advance nor to defend the truth, neither to profit by past errors, nor to imitate past virtues.

If to do injustice to Paul were an outrage on the principles of Christianity, it were hardly less so to asperse those whom God raised up for the especial purpose of rescuing his word from the thralldom and the corruptions of papal Rome. We cannot respond to flattery, without being ourselves flatterers; nor endorse calumny without convicting ourselves of falsehood. Where the interests of truth and righteousness are concerned, we cannot be too devoid of all selfish and malign feelings. If we pray to be delivered from "envy, wrath, malice, and all uncharitableness" towards those around us, it is equally necessary to prefer the same petition when we come to investigate the history of men "of whom the world was not worthy." A better acquaintance with the Reformers, we cannot but think, would promote a greater harmony of view in relation to their characters and doings; while the cultivation of a better spirit in studying their history would be a more favorable indication of the state of religion, and an omen for good to the cause of our common Christianity.

It is only of late that the Reformation has been viewed with a distinct reference to Calvin. Heretofore all biographical notices of him have been brief and unsatisfactory, and all representations of him either fanatically abusive or

extravagantly laudatory. So long as the spirit of controversy led Protestants of different communions either to magnify the failings of the Reformers, or to deny and conceal them; so long as it was common to judge of any particular church organization from the character of the man with whose memory it is popularly identified, it was impossible that Calvin should be justly regarded in a historical point of view. We have at last begun to perceive that no system is to be judged of by either the virtues or the faults of him whose name it may bear; that all evangelical churches have indeed but a sandy foundation, if they rest on nothing else but the names and merits of the Reformers; and above all, that we cannot with very marked consistency censure the ignorance and prejudice of those times, while we ourselves remain in discreditable ignorance, and pertinaciously cherish the bitterest prejudices. Ultraists, perhaps, there will ever be—they who, owing to either an illogical faculty, an essentially narrow understanding, or a bad heart, must, as it were of necessity, assail or disparage all who cannot accord with their assumptions, or succumb to their dogmatism. Still, with the progress of science and letters, and with the diffusion of scriptural knowledge and of a Christian spirit, there has been a growing disposition to interchange views, and canvass sentiments, and ascertain truth, in relation to all matters which either time has obscured, or prejudice perverted. When so many minds are competent to the task of historic inquiry, and of weighing evidence; when, too, so many respond in their views of the great essential principles of Christianity, bigotry can do little else than expose its own pitiable spleen, while sinister motives must defeat their end.

The work before us could hardly have been written at an earlier period of the church; or, if it had, the mind of the church would scarcely have been prepared to appreciate its merits. We regard it, therefore, as opportune—greatly in advance of all preceding writers, though not in every respect supplying all that could be desired in a memoir of so remarkable a man. And we cannot but indulge the hope which the author has expressed, “that it may serve to awaken attention not only to the genius of Calvin, but to the man himself, whom the world has so long misrepresented; and that it may be regarded as exhibiting him in his proper

character, without any attempt to adorn it, but with the same conscientious regard to truth which he himself would have displayed had he written his own life."

As a history, it is less interesting than that of Luther, but equally important and more suggestive; less adapted to awaken religious emotions among the people, but more fitted to stimulate the inquiries and direct the energies of thinking minds. There was little in Calvin's character to attract popular admiration, and there is less in his life that may be worked up for popular effect:—no convent to which we may trace him, as in the case of Luther, and there witness the struggles of a soul groping its way through the mists of papal errors up to light and peace; no secluded castle in which he is imprisoned, and left for years to his own meditations and studies; no Diet before which he boldly and sublimely avows his simple faith in God's word; no visions and vigils, no bare-headed and bare-footed circumambulations for alms, such as attracted the vulgar gaze to Loyola; none of the trappings of ecclesiastical dignity and rule, nor the smiles of royal patronage, which secured to Cranmer both influence and renown. His life is strikingly marked by the absence of all that is either dramatic or romantic, either tasteful or sentimental. Still, the author has so interwoven Calvin's life with Calvin's times, that our interest in the latter extends to the former, and we find ourselves led on from considering the complicated relations which he sustained to the men and events of his day, to the contemplation of the *man himself*, in all his robust intellectuality and rugged truthfulness, his steadfastness of will, his transparent candor, his simple yet laborious life, his sublime death-bed scene, the fruits of his ripened learning and holy faith, the influence of his preaching, his writings, and his example on the church, the state, and the world.

In the course of this work, the reader is introduced to a variety of personages—the chivalric Luther, the sturdy Zwingli, and the faithful Bullinger; Farel, the intrepid herald; Melancthon, the "beloved brother;" and the equally amiable, though more courageous Beza. Then we have a glimpse of Bucer, whose services were so valuable, and of Cranmer, who afterwards so nobly atoned for his "guilty hand," and of Knox, who bore himself so valiantly in the great battle

of the church's freedom. Here, too, is seen the elegant Erasmus, the liberal Socinus, with others of like sentiments and not dissimilar policy, and more conspicuously than all other errorists, the unhappy and never to be forgotten Servetus. Meanwhile, we are enabled to trace Calvin through all the relations of his eventful life; to see him in his house, in his study, in his pulpit, in the council-chamber, in his works, in his controversies, in his various correspondences, in his sympathies with the suffering witnesses of the truth, in the company of his friends and while surrounded by enemies, in his all but superhuman efforts to reform the church in her doctrine and discipline, to correct the evils and promote the welfare of society.

It is obviously a work of great research, and on the whole reliable, candid, and fair; though, as a life of Calvin, too much in favor of him to gratify his enemies, and too little to satisfy his over-zealous friends. If Dr. Stebbins's translation were exact in every particular, which is far from being the case, we should still be constrained to differ from the author in some of his comments, as in those places where he adverts to what he conceives to be the distinction between the Calvinistic form of the Presbyterian system and that of the primitive church, and where he favors the invidious insinuation that Calvin, as president or moderator of the Consistory or Session, had become bishop of Geneva, and did in this way virtually recommend the episcopal element. (See pages 395, 401, vol. i.)

From the tenor of his remarks (pp. 1, 413, 414, 420) in relation to the use of crosses, to the desirableness of having places of refuge for the sick in mind, and to the "pious custom" of praying at any hour of the day in some church, we dissent *in toto*. All such things are no more in unison with the spirit of the gospel than with the genius of Protestantism. In the course of his remarks, too, he sometimes contradicts himself, and fails in philosophic discrimination; but we cheerfully concede to him all due credit for his intention to furnish his readers with everything essential to a right judgment of Calvin; and no one will dispute his facts, who would not, with such men as Bolsec and Tossanus prefer to slander, with Audin caricature, or, with Dyer, withhold and pervert for private ends. Dr. Henry is less obnoxious to the

charge of prejudice, because, in the prosecution of his work, it was his desire to promote reform, to point out the errors of Romanism and the defects of Protestantism; and as Calvin formed a link in the chain of all events at that period, to follow him through his course of varied labors, and to unfold his views rather than to delineate his character or vindicate his memory, and through him to point the way to a wiser and a nobler future; thus directing attention to Calvin as at once an example of living faith, and an armory "whence weapons may be drawn for every Christian in his good fight against all the powers of antichrist."

The plan of the work is such as subserves that end.

1. To show the victory which Calvin won for his faith, and which ever remained the same, though seen at its culminating point in the second edition of the "Institutes."
2. To trace his endeavor to frame such a form of government and discipline for the church, as might secure its life, its holy evangelical life, and plant it permanently in the community.
3. His efforts to protect the unity of the church and the objects of the Reformation, and by consequence, his severe conflict against such false teachers as Castellio, Westphal, and others, and which reached its height in the proceedings against Servetus.

We have followed him through all his pages, and risen with a profound conviction of Calvin's integrity and energy as a man, his humility and fidelity as a believer, his resources and exactness as a scholar, and his depth and force as a thinker. His outward life might soon be told: it is his inner life that is so remarkable—the nature of his mission that is so important, and yet so difficult to be understood; which no one can appreciate who cannot sympathize with a spirit fired with holy zeal in God's service, and burning with an irrepressible desire to bring the world "into captivity unto the obedience of Christ." Such a man, from the very nature of his work, could not but have been misunderstood, if not hated, by multitudes in his day. They who had confounded libertinism with Protestantism, or mistaken deliverance from Rome for "the glorious liberty of the children of God," could no more form a just judgment of Calvin, than if they had viewed him through the medium of papal bigotry and superstition. Decried even by the Lutherans as

well as denounced by papists; hated and reviled by free thinkers and voluptuaries, and sometimes mistaken and censured by the members of his own communion, he has been exposed to more obloquy, and suffered more wrongs than any other religious leader of the Reformation. Conscious of being the one marked object of misrepresentation and abuse, he was at one time so borne down in spirit that there seemed no consolation for him but in the thought that death would soon afford him deliverance. "If I had the choice," said he, "I would far rather submit myself at once to be burnt by the papists, than to be thus lacerated, without ceasing, by my neighbors."

Though prejudices often sleep in the grave, and Calvin may now be viewed with a more candid eye, a longer time must elapse, we fear, before full justice will be done to his character and works. In order to this there must be a deeper understanding of the principles on which the Reformation was founded, and a purer, wider sympathy with the spirit of the gospel. Such a man could hardly have lived in any age of the church without having warm friends and bitter enemies; but considering the importance which has been attached to the Reformation, the interest with which it has always been invested in the view of Protestants, and above all, the inestimable benefits which have resulted to society from the free teachings of a pure gospel, it is strange that he should have been singled out, as it were, for peculiar and envenomed reprehension, and that still so many are unwilling to look with a dispassionate eye into the facts of his history. While Luther is spoken of with fairness, and often with commendation, it may be said that few praise Calvin but with reluctance, nor then without some ungracious insinuation. That he was opposed, maligned, vilified by the papists, was a matter of course, and no less than he himself must have anticipated, particularly after he had publicly answered, and in so severe a style, the Pope's hypocritical admonition to the Emperor of Germany. They had indeed more to fear from him than even from Luther. The latter had excited a portentous popular tumult against masses and indulgences; but the former, by his untiring efforts to settle the doctrines of the new church upon a scriptural basis, was obviously aiming to secure to it a

durable constitution. A popular excitement might react in favor of the papacy, but not so the advancing cause of truth and righteousness. On the other side, there were not a few among nominal Protestants, who, though willing enough to overthrow, were not so forward to re-construct; though perfectly willing that justice should be exercised against others, had no idea of submitting to justice themselves. To all such, whose love of freedom had degenerated into the love of licentiousness, the Reformation seemed to be complete when masses, and saints'-days, and confessionals were done away. Hence Calvin was denounced no less by those who had adopted the popular view of the Reformation than by the adherents of the papacy. We are of opinion, however, that his memory has suffered more from Protestants than from Romanists: at any rate the prejudices of the former have often been as gross as the aspersions of the latter; and in what way can this be satisfactorily explained? This is the question which we propose to answer.

Was he ambitious? Any one may be obnoxious to such a charge, not excepting the apostle Paul himself, if an ardent zeal for the purity and extension of the church of God is to be confounded with the love of self-exaltation. But as surely as that men are not always actuated by that motive, Calvin could not have been influenced by selfish ambition in defending doctrines which were so contrary to the opinions and prejudices of the times; in pursuing a course which demanded increasing toil and self-denial, and exposed him more and more to obloquy. To have sought distinction for its own sake, would rather have been an indication of insanity in times when conspicuity in the Protestant cause only brought upon itself the heavier burdens, and secured to itself the greater perils. Or, to have been swayed in his efforts to inculcate right views of faith and practice, by a supreme desire to rule the church, is a supposition which cannot be reconciled with the submission of his own will to the teachings of God's word, and his habitual endeavors to make that word the arbiter in all disputes. "Bishop of Geneva," he was invidiously called, but it is yet to be proved that he sought the office of a prelatical bishop. A *pope*, too, he was often sarcastically denominated, but it was solely in consequence of his resolute effort to establish

the faith of the church on the basis of God's written word, and with it the church's unity. If a pope, he was so in the noblest sense of the term, as an apostolic champion of the truth. Conscious of a new life within him, feeling the hand of a mightier will than his own ever pressing him onward, and possessing spiritual and moral qualities such as are seldom seen united, "Calvin's greatness was his fate"—the greatness of the few whom God has raised up to deliver his church in times of trial—whose motives have ever been suspected because they are above the sensual judgment, and whose characters have been mistaken because of the vastness of the tasks to which they were called.

It is obvious that had Calvin remained in the Romish communion, he would in all probability have risen to the loftiest honors. Descended from honorable lineage, enjoying from his childhood the benefit of a learned education, brought up with the children of one of the noblest families, and by his eighteenth year receiving the tonsure, and invested with the living of Marteville; at a time, too, when Rome stood in the most urgent need of some one who could plausibly defend her dogmas, never had man a better opportunity of gratifying an ambitious desire than young Calvin. But no sooner did he discover the errors of the Catholic church than he resigned his benefice; and no sooner did he, by the thorough study of the Bible, attain unto the knowledge of the truth, than, contrary to his father's plans, he abandoned the study of the law, laid his account with parental displeasure, with the contempt of his relatives, with the vindictive hatred of the Romanists, with a life of toil and suffering, and gave himself up unreservedly to the service of the gospel of Christ. If he was ambitious, that *seal* of his representing *a hand holding out a burning heart*, most clearly indicates the nature of his ambition:—"I give thee all! I keep back nothing for myself!"—such a lofty purpose as directs and fires all one's energies when God's Spirit changes the heart, and moulds it for his especial service. No worldly motives, no relative endearments, no selfish suggestions, can blunt or stay the one grand conviction of truth and duty. So Vico, who afterwards became the friend of Calvin, though descended from the ancient race of the Caraccioli, and brought up in the court of an emperor, and

surrounded by all that ministered to the pride and vanity of the worldly mind, overcame all temptations, resisted all persuasions, left father, mother, wife and children, his lordly palace, the court and its attractions, to become an exile, to endure poverty and want, and to become an object of aversion even to his friends—exclaiming, as he made the sacrifice, “I can now, O Lord, deny myself—blessed be banishment, and the cross, which tear me from the vanities and sins of the world.” But as in his case, so in that of Calvin; it was not ambition; it was what the world is ever slow to admit, because it can form no conception of the victory won by God’s Spirit—it was the triumph of grace over nature.

It is hardly necessary, then, to inquire whether he was avaricious; yet he was accused of being so. “People,” said he, in his preface to the Commentaries on the Psalms, “circulate ridiculous rumors respecting my treasures and my wealthy sort of life.” But although there was nothing monkish in his life, his mode of living was the extreme of simplicity; and though his stipend was uniformly small, he would accept no present from a friend, except for the poor, and gained but little from the publication of his books. He would receive nothing without rendering an equivalent—and rather than not live on what was his own, would sell his books to meet an exigency. To incur as little expense as possible either in the way of dress, or of living—to receive no more than was exactly his due—to meet every just claim—to relieve the wants of the poor and the suffering—to set an example of frugality, and of justice, and charity, was his aim; and notwithstanding the aspersions of his enemies, it appears that at his death all his possessions amounted to only 200 dollars, together with a silver goblet, the only present he ever accepted, and which he bequeathed to his brother.

In like manner we might show from our author’s numerous authorities that he was neither equivocal in his policy, nor underhanded in his measures; neither selfish nor cowardly; neither unamiable nor unfriendly; neither illiberal nor implacable. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that he could not endure subtleties, and never employed dissimulation; that he was at once open and honorable, generous, sympathizing, and void of fear; susceptible

of the purest friendship and sincerest love; forward to forgive any personal insult or injury, to acknowledge merit, to appreciate kindness, to welcome co-operation in every good word and work; and, where a perverse will was not apparent, slow to make even theological differences and distinctions a sufficient cause for separation. A man to whom such characters as Farel, and Viret, and Beza, were bound by ties of the profoundest respect and the warmest regard, could not have been unsocial and morose. A man, with whom Martyr, and Bucer, and Bullinger, and Gualter, and John à Lasco, not to speak of many others, labored in one spirit, and with one aim, could not have been narrow in his views, or sectarian in his feelings; nor could Calvin have been so kind in his treatment of the Italian refugees, or so indulgent to Socinus, whom he regarded as an excellent man, struggling to find the truth, had he been the gloomy fanatic—the hard-hearted and bigoted persecutor, his enemies have been ever wont to represent him.

Melancthon and Beza were men of remarkably bland tempers and fascinating manners, and in comparison with them, Calvin's natural disposition appears to disadvantage. Compared too with Luther, he is less hearty, less social, and in no wise jovial; with Farel less impulsive; or with Martyr and Œcolampadius, less calm and gentle; but in all the virtues that make home a retreat from the storm without, in all the qualities which command respect for character, give weight to counsels, secure confidence in the hour of need, and enlist the sympathy of noble minds, Calvin will compare not unfavorably with any of the names which signalize and adorn the era of the Reformation; while in all that appertains to the science of the will of God, and to the interpretation of God's word—in his profound deference to the authority of the Scriptures, as the only source of living faith—in his intense conscientiousness, and undoubting convictions of the truth, and self-sacrificing love of unity in the faith—in the severity of his studies, the vast extent of his correspondence, the high order of his works, and the multiplicity of his labors—in all that indicates the strongest power of thought and of will, and the movement of a true man—in all that tells us of the triumph of mind over matter, of faith over sense, of grace over nature—John

Calvin stands pre-eminent among the great and good men of that period in the church's history.

Such, however, is the prejudice which the bare mention of his name not unfrequently awakens, that any favorable judgment respecting him, will, by some, be regarded as the result of only a partial view of his character and life; but the opposition which he encountered, the obloquy which was heaped on him, and the feelings of aversion with which his memory has been so often and so long regarded, all admit of a satisfactory explanation—one, too, that serves to exhibit his mental and moral lineaments in a stronger light; to evince, the earnestness, and clearness, and scientific order of his thoughts, the impregnable strength of his decisions, the wide sweep of his sympathies and solitudes, his love of truth, and purity, and order, and unity—the vigilance as well as the energy of his zeal, and his passionate abhorrence of all that tended to pervert God's word, or obscure the glory of his name.

The difference in Calvin's position from that of Luther has not been clearly considered, or the latter would not have been so often applauded to the disparagement of the former. Weary of life and of the conflict, Luther left the stage, at the very time when the Protestant cause stood most in need of a master mind and a dauntless spirit, when misshapen views were to be reduced to the proportions of heaven-born truth, when discordant elements were to be harmonized and melted into love and peace, when lawless passions were to be curbed and regulated, when secret machinations, and false professions, and rival interests, and internal dissensions threatened the loss of all that had been so gloriously achieved. Following Luther into the field, Calvin was in point of time second in the cause; and as such, there was for him less renown, less enthusiasm, but if possible, greater responsibility, greater expense of feeling, and incomparably more difficulty and trial—dangers less formidable, but no less real; a task less exposed to the gaze of the world, but demanding a depth and reach of thought to which the German Reformer, with all his living energy, was unequal. If, as has been said, the watchword of Luther was war, that of the other was, order. The movement of the former was aggressive; that of the latter, defensive. The one burst

the shackles which Popery had thrown around the Bible, and laid it open, by virtue of his translation, to be known and read by all his countrymen; the other penetrated critically into its meaning, rejected whatever did not agree with it, and aimed to reform the faith as well as order of the church, solely according to its standard. The one a bold and fearless soldier, braving alike both pope and devil; the other a counsellor, learned in the law and in the gospel, comprehensive as well as discriminating in his views, always true in intent, if not in fact, to the statute book of heaven. Whatever their individual peculiarities, both were alike earnest, heroic spirits; yet their work, though in heart the same, was different in direction; and hence, the one enjoyed admiration and gratitude, while the other encountered criticism and blame.

It was wisely ordered that these two men, though the greatest of their kind and engaged in the same great work, should not synchronously appear in the same country. Though identical in their opposition to Rome, and in their faith in God's word, yet such were their characteristic differences, that in all probability they could not have lived together. Alike resolute—the one from the strength of his character, the other from the force of his reason; alike firm—the one from fearlessness, the other from decision—neither would have yielded in any social disputation that might have occurred, and a separation would have ensued, detrimental to the cause which they alike loved, and for which neither held his life dear unto himself. Even Melancthon sometimes found himself in a painful position, not coinciding in all particulars with Doctor Martin's views, and yet, unwilling to oppose him in debate, not daring to dissent from him in his sweeping condemnation of Zwingli, and yet so deeply afflicted at the breach which Luther's violence had caused, that he longed "to retreat quietly into his own soul, and there endeavor to find that freedom of conscience which he could not enjoy under the guardianship of Luther."

The infirmities of age, acting on a mind characteristically self-confident, and through success in its various conflicts, not only with the Romanists, but with the Anabaptists, rendered at last dogmatic and overbearing, probably enhanced the violence of his temper, and made it more hazardous to

differ from him—more difficult even to approach him. Hence, Melancthon had not the courage to lay Calvin's letter before Luther, though the only one that he ever wrote to him, and this was in relation to the Zurichers—a letter couched in terms of the most Christian courtesy, and indicating his great deference to the German Reformer. Shortly before Luther's death he wrote to Bullinger, adjuring him to treat the great man with respect.

"For I hear," said he, "that Luther assails not only you, but all of us with horrible abuse. Now I can scarcely ask you to be silent. . . . I wish, however, that it may be clearly understood, in the first place, how great a man Luther is; by what extraordinary gifts he is distinguished; and with what energy of soul, with what perseverance, with what ability and success he has continued up to the present day to overthrow the kingdom of antichrist, and to extend at the same time the doctrine of salvation. I have already often said, that were he to call me a devil, I should still continue to venerate him as a chosen servant of God, uniting with extraordinary virtues some great failings. Would to heaven that he had striven more to subdue those tempests of feeling which he has so continually allowed to break forth! Would that he had only employed that violence, so natural to him, against the enemies of truth, and not against the servants of God! Would that he had exercised more care to discover his own defects! Unhappily there was too great a crowd of flatterers about him, who added still more to the self-confidence peculiar to his nature. It is even our duty to view his failings in such a light, that we may the more properly estimate his extraordinary gifts. I beg you, therefore, to bear in mind that we have to do with one of the first servants of Christ, with one to whom we all owe much!"—Vol. ii. p. 16.

Had Calvin been treated with the indulgence which he thus urged should be exercised towards Luther, with what different sentiments would his name have been transmitted! Imperfections cleave to the best of men. In relation to these two, the faults of the one, though in some respects different, were no greater than the faults of the other. Luther's indignation against the Zwinglians was so greatly excited because of his impression that their doctrine annihilated the very essence of the sacrament. Having no sympathy with their views, he had but little patience with any one who

ventured to show wherein they were scripturally right and he himself was wrong. It is not improbable that for a moment Luther might have been irritated against Calvin, but it could have been only for the moment. There is reason to suppose that as Zwingli, in the latter years of his life, had a deeper insight into the sacrament, so Luther, a short time before his death, was of one faith and one mind with Calvin. It is certain that he never regarded his Genevan brother as holding either dangerous or heretical notions, and quite probable that he ultimately viewed his doctrine as fitted to restore union to the distracted church. In his well known letter to Bucer, in 1539, he sent Calvin his greeting, whose "Institutes" he had read *cum singulari voluptate*. Of Calvin's answer to Sadolet's address to the Genevese, he remarked, "This writing has hands and feet, and I rejoice that God has called up such people, who, if it be his will, may give the final blow to the Papacy, and finish by his help what I have commenced against anti-christ." When the bookseller at Wittemberg handed him Calvin's treatise on the Lord's Supper, it is stated, that after examining it, he said to Maurice "This is certainly a learned and pious man, and I might well have intrusted the whole affair of this controversy to him from the beginning. I confess my part. If my opponents had done the like, we should soon have been reconciled." And not long before his death, he remarked to Melancthon, who had proposed to him the publication of some pacific treatise, "I have thought anxiously on this matter; but as I might throw suspicion on the whole doctrine, I will only commend it to the good care of God—Do you do something after my death." Nor is it supposable that while giving such instruction to his compeer, he could have been ignorant of Melancthon's esteem for Calvin, and harmony with his view respecting the nature of the sacrament. It was probably from having understood this from Melancthon's letters, that Calvin wrote as follows to a minister at Strasburg:—

"If that excellent servant of the Lord, and faithful doctor of the church, Martin Luther, were still alive, he would not be so severe and implacable as to refuse his ready assent to this confession, namely, that that is truly afforded us which the sacraments figure, and that

we are, therefore, partakers of the body and blood of Christ. How often did Luther say, that he contended for nothing but that it might be clearly understood, that the Lord does not mock us with empty signs, but that he fulfils inwardly that which is represented to the eye, and that thus the substance is connected with the sign ! Hence if I do not greatly err, we are agreed, that the Lord's Supper is no vain, dramatic representation of a spiritual feast, but that it truly imparts to us what it presents, and that holy hearts are nourished therein by the body and blood of Christ."

He attached the last importance to this ordinance ; it was "the central point of his spiritual life," the means of his assurance that God had never forsaken him, the medium of a most intimate communion with Christ, and with all believers ; and with regard to its nature and design, it may be said, that from the beginning of the controversy, he occupied a place between Zwingli on the one hand, and Luther on the other—maintaining to the last the same view which he had taught both in the schools and in the churches ; "That the body of Christ was *truly and really*, but *not naturally* offered to believers in this sacrament ; that neither the worthy nor the unworthy could, in, with, or under, the bread, receive Him bodily, seeing that where space has ceased to exist, no body can be properly spoken of, but that the believing soul must raise itself in the sacrament to hold communion with Him who manifests himself as truly and really as if he were present in the body ; and that this communion which believers have with the body and blood of Christ, involves a spiritual mystery, neither to be seen by the eye, nor comprehended by the mind of man"—thus rejecting the idea of the sacrament being a mere commemoration, defining the actual but spiritual presence of the Lord, and maintaining the true communion of the blood and of the body, while admitting the mystery which it involves :—altogether comprising a view of the sacrament which, as it at once implies and induces a true living faith, might profitably unite the views of Christians. Neither Calvin nor Luther was right in attempting to explain *how* Christ was present in the sacrament, especially as they both admitted the mystery ; but had they been contented with simply acknowledging his presence ; and more particularly, had not Luther so vehemently insisted on the notion of a personal communication,

the Helvetic Confession would most probably have passed into the Augsburg Confession ; and instead of the Lutherans being opposed to the Calvinists, the whole evangelical church, Dr. Henry thinks, and not without reason, might have been one in name, as well as in spirit.

Though dogmatic differences are not to be avoided, yet, as the theology of both Luther and Calvin was the result of a living faith in the Holy Scriptures, and not the product of the understanding, they were alike animated by the same Christian sentiment, and in fact united by one spirit. But as the pride of reason began to displace the humility of faith, and more importance was attached to the necessity of comprehending whatever was believed than to the life of faith in the soul, differences of opinion were magnified, and passions enkindled, and parties arrayed ; and it is not surprising that they who idolized the old professor at Wittenburg should have extolled him to the disparagement of the severe preacher of Geneva.

Calvin lived in the season of transition, from the darkness, and corruptions, and disorder of anti-Christianity, to the light, and purity, and order of the gospel. With the diffusion of knowledge, and, by consequence, the liberation of mind from the thralldom of spiritual despotism, a spirit of inquiry was awakened, which, through the pride and self-sufficiency of the mind of the flesh, rapidly disengaged itself from the restraints of both authority and Scripture, until at last heresy, with all the serpent's subtlety, scattered tares,—aiming to insinuate doubt, to create distrust, and to incite and array the darkest passions against the teachings of truth ; or, with brazen and foul-mouthed effrontery, exerted its force at once to deface the great doctrines of the gospel, and to undermine and destroy the newly-reformed church. It is evident that from the unobstructed spread of false doctrines, the church would have been exposed to dangers, though less appalling, no less real than those from which it had just been delivered ; and if the milder apostolic spirit would have been inefficient in her desperate conflict with Rome, it had been equally so in contending with ruthless heresies and malignant factions. Calvin's discourses, therefore, on predestination, as well as his various treatises against heresy, had their origin in the necessities of the age ; and had it not

been for a mind so constituted, so stored, and so controlled—free from doubt and from fear—at once quick to detect, forward to expose, and keen to confute error; not to be perplexed by sophistry, abashed by pretensions, nor deterred by difficulties, clear in its convictions and firm in its purposes, it admits of doubt whether the great doctrines of the Bible would then have been so faithfully preached, or so nobly defended. How true it is, and how consolatory to reflect, that when any special work is needed in the church, God, in his own time, and at the right time, raises up and qualifies the suitable agent, rendering him in all respects equal to the emergency, and in his history verifying the declaration that they who do know their God *shall be strong*.

"We have the Holy Spirit," said Calvin, "as a true and certain witness of our doctrine: we know that we preach eternal truth. If the ingratitude or stiff-neckedness of those whom we would help, be such as to bring about the destruction of the whole building of God, then will I here say what it becomes a Christian to declare. We shall die; but in dying we shall be conquerors, not only because death will afford us an entrance into a better world, but because our blood will be as seed to diffuse far around the truth of God, which the world now seeks to destroy."

It was the great mission of Protestantism to set in the clearest light God's truth for man's salvation, in opposition to man's inventions to save himself. Luther had taken his stand on the doctrine of "Justification by Faith," and bravely had he defended his position; but Luther had not viewed this grand principle in all its relations, nor had his arguments exhausted the subject. It remained for Calvin to search out, and designate, and cover with shame and confusion the fundamental error of pride and disbelief; and if ever a man evinced singleness of purpose, and all the noble energies of a self-sacrificing devotion, it was John Calvin when, clad in Heaven's panoply, he went forth to overthrow and crush that ancient sin which no less endangered the cause of the reformed church than it had always promoted and upheld the entire system of papal error and superstition—a sin not peculiar to Rome, nor foreign to Geneva, but common to the

race—the sin of a self-righteous world, which, under divers forms of doctrine, denies man's fall into an estate of sin and misery, and in its efforts to save itself, virtually places man in God's stead, ever exalting and trusting in man, but distrusting and degrading God—magnifying the sufficiency of man's reason, and the self-controlling power of his will, but disparaging God's Word, and contemning God's mercy and grace through Jesus Christ.

Calvin's doctrine of predestination met with marked resistance, and though on this point he practically agreed with Luther, he gave to it a prominence in his preaching which could have been justified only by the necessity of the times. In no other way could the general mind have been brought to bow to God's supremacy, and led to ascribe all the glory of man's salvation to Him to whom alone it is due. But there was nothing of gentleness and humility in the spirit by which he was seemingly characterized; no persuasiveness in his manner; on the contrary, there was a daringness in his nature, a fiery excess, a vehemence of expression, and in controversy, oftentimes an attitude of contemptuous defiance, or of withering sarcasm, which prejudiced his cause, by awakening a feeling of resistance against himself personally as against one who aimed to command assent or force submission to his views. Some could not understand how there could be much of the Spirit of Christ where there was so great a resemblance to a prophet of the old covenant; others could not discriminate between his zealous, energetic inculcation of a doctrine, and that love of victory which is so natural to man; and others, again, unable to meet his arguments, perverted his language, and aimed to prejudice the popular judgment by conveying the impression that he represented God as a tyrant, and the author of sin; that he annihilated man's free moral agency, and excluded infants from salvation. Hence his difficulty with the Bernese in relation to "predestination," and their admonition to the Genevese to "preserve order and to see that their ministers preached so as to offend no one, nor even in their books to investigate the deep secrets of God, which was not necessary, nor likely to conduce to edification." They also determined to pronounce no opinion respecting Calvin's doctrine, and much less to inquire into it. Nor even at this day is it surprising

that such a doctrine should have been a fruitful source of opposition, and still less, that Calvin, in consequence of his declaration that "he was contending not for himself but for the truth," and that he had devoted his life to this great doctrine, and would never cease to proclaim and defend it, should have become, in many instances, an object of aversion. No doctrine is more at variance with the pre-conceptions and prejudices of the carnal mind; and whenever it is approached without humility and prayer, the understanding must be confounded, and the darkest passions of our fallen nature may be aroused. Thus the Jews were filled with wrath against Jesus, and thrust him out of the city, and would have thrown him from off the brow of a hill, simply because he had told them of a truth that Elias was sent unto only one out of the many widows that were in Israel in his days, and that though there were many lepers in Israel, none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian!

But no man, resting solely on his own understanding, can solve the great problem of necessity and freedom; either some, it will be held, are of necessity led to salvation, and others to damnation, if grace is the sole cause of the spiritual difference in men, or all are urged on to eternal ruin by a free will which God has given them, and the consequences of which he must have foreseen. The doctrine of a responsible will in connexion with the divine purposes, involves a mystery, and necessarily demands faith, and can be admitted only on the credit of revelation, and is admitted and believed by all who submit their minds and hearts to the teachings of Inspiration. No doctrine is more scriptural and more philosophical than the Calvinistic view of the Divine purposes; but unhappily the language of theology can in no way be relieved from the disadvantage under which it has always labored from its anthropological form, and this doctrine is often conveyed in a medium that prejudices and repels by the bad uses to which, in some instances, it has been applied. Hence, in after times, Wesley, from regard to the great principles of Christian purity, which he saw to be endangered, separated from Whitefield and protested against the Genevan doctrine of the "election by grace;" but his protest, as Isaac Taylor justly says, "though good and solid as related to Antinomian enormities, was only a film, or an

evasion, as it stood related to Calvinistic truths." While rejecting the "election by grace," too, on account of its inseparable alliance, as he supposed, with "reprobation," he lost sight of the grand fact that the spiritual condition of the human family involves of itself a mystery insolvable without the Bible, and not to be relieved of its oppressive weight upon our minds, even by its aid, if the Genevan view does not constitute a right rendering. While in theory at variance with Calvin, he was himself, as a preacher of repentance, going forth with a heart full of zeal for men's salvation, because of their awful condition—practically one with him. The very point which distinguishes Calvinism as a system, was virtually embraced in Wesley's preaching, inferable, indeed, from his own unavoidable admissions. Sovereign grace must be, in its relation to individuals, discriminating grace. Every instance in which the gospel is embraced, and its benefits appropriated by faith, is strictly, necessarily referable to that same grace whence originated the whole scheme of man's redemption from sin and misery; nor is there any escape from this connexion, except we take the forlorn ground that man could of himself have devised and achieved his own salvation. But so long as such a position is repudiated, it follows that the knowledge of this salvation, no less than a personal interest in it, must be a free gift, for what could not have been devised and achieved without God, cannot be apprehended and appropriated without his Spirit.

Much, however, depends on the stand-point from which this doctrine is viewed, and on the temper with which it is approached, whether any two reasoning minds will agree in relation to it. And, therefore, Calvin said to the Bernese, "I know well enough that we ought to be humble and modest in the treatment of this profound, incomprehensible mystery; but, if you had looked into my much misrepresented book, your Excellences would have discovered that its only object is to subdue the pride of the human spirit, and to teach it to reverence, in all fear and humility, the majesty of God, without, in any wise, giving the reins to an idle curiosity. But if people will indiscreetly abuse this doctrine, and attempt to correct the Holy Spirit, we must strike out of the Scriptures what is openly revealed to us in

their pages. I cannot but wonder that I alone am attacked; for if what I have said be compared with what has been set forth by the most learned men in Germany, it will be found that my language is far more cautious than theirs. I therefore adjure you, according to the precept of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you show no respect to persons; since, though my name and books should perish, what the prophets and apostles have said would endure for ever; and it is *from them that I have derived the doctrine which man condemns.*"

Hated though he was, and exposed to a host of the bitterest enemies, at this time he found friends disinterested enough to espouse his cause. "I testify before God," said Beza, with the resolution and self-denial characteristic of the noblest mind, "that Calvin has not been too earnest in this matter. I admire, on the contrary, his patience and moderation in contending with so many bad spirits." And, again, in conjunction with Viret, who was also one of the frank and choice spirits of the times, "We confess that having become acquainted with his teaching and with his work on predestination, and his various expositions of Scripture, we acknowledge, according to our consciences, that his doctrine is agreeable to the Bible." Bullinger also united with Calvin; and even Melancthon, though so unlike him in disposition, continued to sympathize with him, and their agreement in most points of faith lasted through a period of seventeen years; while, it must be admitted by any one who carefully examines his works, that he defended his main position and showed its agreement not only with the teachings of Augustine, but more especially with the writings of Paul. Whenever the difficulties of his system of doctrine were pointed out, he would candidly acknowledge that he could not comprehend so great a mystery, and that we ought to be content to receive that which God has been pleased to reveal to us, and to teach in His holy word. Still, he maintained that God, though his will governs all, cannot be the author of sin; that there is no other necessity for sin than that which exists in the corruption of the will; that freedom to choose evil always pre-supposes a kind of corruption already existing in the being; that compulsion and force are a contradiction to the proper nature of the will, but that it is not altogether free because, through its innate corrup-

tion, it is necessarily impelled to evil, and can desire nothing but what is evil; that, therefore, necessity and a free assent may agree together, and that the will is delivered from this bondage of corruption only through grace. And in like manner, he maintained, that his doctrine, so far from tending to antinomianism, involved the absolute necessity of obedience, morality, sacrifices, and resignation, constituted an additional and the strongest reason for the necessity of repentance and faith, for the diligent use also of all the means of grace, and that it did not preclude belief in the salvation of unbaptized infants. With regard to this last point, his views are indeed worthy of being transcribed and remembered. Let our modern advocates of baptismal regeneration duly ponder them, and if their love of priestly domination will not admit of their endorsing such views, let the horrible consequences of their own dogma render them more lenient in their judgment of John Calvin, the predestinarian.

"Baptism," said he, "is indeed the sign of salvation, and the seal that we are accepted of God. But in either circumstance we are inscribed in the book of life, as well by the free grace of God as by his promises. Our children, accordingly, are redeemed, for it is written, 'I am the God of thy children;' otherwise they could not be baptized. By giving too much honor to the outward sign, we should offend God; and by supposing that our own salvation is not sufficiently secured by his promise, we should throw a doubt upon his truth. There being then no disrespect to the sacrament on your part, no harm can happen to your child, because it died before it was possible for you to bring it to baptism."—Vol. i. p. 474.

"Unless we would overthrow every principle of religion, we must admit that salvation does not depend upon the baptism of the child, but that it is merely consigned by baptism." "Baptism does not confer upon infants the power of becoming sons and heirs of God, but because they are in that position and degree in relation to God, the grace of baptism is sealed in their flesh by baptism. Otherwise the Anabaptists rightly deny them the sacrament."—Vol. i. pp. 205-6.

Little children, therefore, according to Calvin, are endowed with grace, though not baptized, because they are born in the holy covenant. And yet the sacrament is profitable to them, as affording indications of grace which promote the

new birth. How comforting is such a view to Christian parents who may have lost children before they were baptized! In this respect, Calvin differed from Luther; for he regarded baptism as essential, and connected with exorcism!

It is a fair question, however, whether the prominence which he gave to the doctrine of predestination, did not impair the evangelical character of his preaching; by enforcing it with such power of argumentation, whether he did not inadvertently convey the idea of mechanical necessity; by the daring and severe manner in which he stripped man, the sinner, of all good and of all power, and of all credit, whether he did not awaken an unnecessary degree of hostility to the truth of God, and even convey the impression to minds, unable to comprehend the workings of his own spirit, that his God was indeed a hard master—not a God of love?

This, however, as Paul Henry remarks, "must ever remain to Calvin's great honor, that speculative as he was by nature, he uniformly subjected his powerful understanding to the Word of God, and consecrated his logical acuteness to the service of truth." Faith was not to be subjected to reason, but reason to faith. Philosophy was but the handmaid of Scripture: man nothing, less than nothing, in comparison with God; God all and in all—the personal God, the ever-living God, the high and holy God, the God who had spoken to Moses, and had revealed himself in the face of Jesus Christ; the sin-hating, the prayer-hearing, the covenant-keeping God. This intensely sublime idea of God, permeated his whole being; impelled him to submit his mind and will to God's, and rendered him content and happy to receive all that God has been pleased to reveal for man's knowledge, belief, and obedience, without any gainsaying, reservation, or lukewarmness. For this reason he considered the doctrine in question as of great practical utility, laying, as it does, man's loftiness in the dust, and giving and securing all glory to God—God in Christ—the giver of every good and every perfect gift. Any view that compromised this great truth, and, by consequence, the doctrines of grace, fired his spirit, roused his energies, as if an enemy had attacked God's citadel, and he alone was there to defend it by the might of his single arm. Taking his stand on God's

Word, and measuring everything according to its standard, he combated in turn, and with equal decision and force, almost every form of error and delusion, of infidelity and worldliness. "Weak and timid as I must confess myself to be," said Calvin, "I saw *the necessity of learning* at the very beginning to struggle with these stormy waves;" and that he had availed himself of all his opportunities, and prepared himself both mentally and spiritually for any field of conflict, is evident from the number and variety of opponents whom he was destined to encounter. There was Caroli, the vagabond apostate; Sadolet, who falsely brought the charge of schism against the Reformers; Balduin who, with a lawyer's skill and a Jesuit's treachery, aimed to defeat the plan of union; Robertus Moshamus, whose overthrow on the doctrine of transubstantiation won for Calvin the title of "The Theologian;" Perrini, the leader of the libertines; Westphal, and Hesshus, and Brentius, and Andrea, the supporters of the real presence: Gentilis, the strangest and most foolish of all antitrinitarians; Bolsec, the coarse assailant of predestination; Castellio, the representative of that lawless spirit of exegesis which is now so common; Pighius the type of modern rationalism, and Servetus that of modern pantheism; while during the whole of the religious war which broke out after Luther's death, Calvin had to deal not only with the disaffected in Switzerland and Germany, but with some of the worst characters known in the history of France.

Situated as he was—the head of the reformed party in Geneva—known as his sentiments were through the medium of his writings which had been extensively circulated, he could not have preserved silence without subjecting himself to the charge of unfaithfulness from his friends, or of pusillanimity from his enemies; and if in his answers to errorists and opposers, he had curbed his spirit and modified his language, yet with such various characters and interests all arrayed against him, he must have been more than human, had he escaped obloquy, or quelled malignity. But with his glowing zeal for truth, there was blended a fixed hatred of all that was infidel and false, cunning, capricious, and frivolous; while his southern blood rendered him habitually excitable, and his bodily sufferings from disease,

ofttimes irritable. With such moral energies, such a physical temperament, and with all, an intellect so acute and active, he must speak out his sentiments, must call things by their right names, must loathe hypocrisy, and despise meanness, and execrate perfidy, and have no patience with either stupidity or quibbling; and if his language was sometimes harsh, and his irony biting, and his invective torrent-like, it was as might have been expected from such a nature so beset and harassed; such as many a good man has indulged in under far less provocation; in which Luther himself was by no means deficient; in which the emissaries of Rome—the Tetzels and Ecks—as far surpassed Calvin, as he all such in his knowledge of the Scriptures and strength of argument. Still, it remains to be proved, that his spirit was malignant, though his words were severe, that he loved conflict rather than peace, or victory for self rather than for truth, or agreement with him instead of the union of all believers. Peace, in his view, was not to be valued at the expense of purity, nor union to the sacrifice of gospel principles; nor were “the barkings and lies of his enemies” to be left unnoticed, as the world might look on him as guilty, and the cause of the Redeemer thereby be wounded. It is in testimony that he could overlook diversity in forms, so long as the gospel was adhered to; that he could make allowance for minor differences, where essential truth was held, or the truth sincerely sought; that no unimportant differences ever alienated him from any of the Reformers, or modified the terms of affection and respect in which he was wont to speak of them; that all injuries and insults to himself personally, “passed by him like the idle wind;” that he was roused only by some attack which menaced danger to the church and the gospel; and that even then, so soon as one retracted his error, or repented of his wrong, he was forward to welcome him with an open heart. “I call Christ,” said he in relation to Westphal (and the same spirit was evinced in other instances), “and all the holy angels to witness, that the moment he will abandon his obstinacy, it shall not be my fault if there do not reign between us friendship and brotherly love. Even now if he will show a brother’s heart towards me, I am ready to love him as a brother in return.” Still, a man who could use what we regard as invidious

epithets, however honest he might have been, or right in his views, could not have been popular, and would have been in many instances hated. The conduct of some of his opponents might naturally have suggested such comparisons, or justly merited such appellations; but it is human nature not to forgive, and much less to forget the man who characterizes its individual development and publishes its loathsome or contemptible traits to the world. Such epithets, however, abound in the vocabulary of the period. With few exceptions, they constitute blots in the controversial writings of the times; and he who on this account censures Calvin, to be consistent, must view the language of other illustrious Reformers according to the standard of modern courtesy and refinement. Just indignation naturally vents itself in plain terms. It requires an unwonted power of self-control to check the appropriate expression for acts which violate all truth and duty; nor is a man blame-worthy for characterizing acts as they deserve. His motive may be wrong, but his utterance will be true. As Electra said to her wicked mother,—

"You do the deeds,
And your ungodly deeds find me the words."

Nor is it necessary that the opponents of the gospel should always be addressed in the same style. This may vary according to the exigencies of the case, the nature of the attack, or the character and standing of the man himself. As pearls should not be thrown before swine, so truth clothed in the language of refined courteousness and classic elegance, would be lost on the coarse, the conceited, the ignorant, or the vicious. Hence, Watson, though dignified in addressing Gibbon, changed his style altogether when he came to reply to Paine, studiously aiming to adapt himself not only to the understanding of an obscene and blasphemous scribbler, but to those of a kindred stamp that would be most in danger from his "Age of Reason." So is there evidence before us in this work of Henry's, that Calvin suited his language to the person whom he addressed. Nothing can exceed his Christian courteousness and scholarly manliness when he addressed himself to those whose official position commanded respect, whose deeds deserved

admiration and gratitude, or whose mental cultivation and good intentions entitled them to consideration. In his various letters to distinguished men of the reformed faith, there is not a line that betrays any want of that respect which was their due, while his epistle to Francis I. is a model of purity and dignity; but woe to the man whose errors or whose vices, whose falsehoods or whose time-serving, stirred him up to mighty wrath. There was tenderness in his nature, there was the deepest humility and self-abasement, great sympathy for the sufferings of others, greater allowance for others than himself, a reluctance to condemn those placed in circumstances where he himself might have yielded; but his opposition to those who opposed gospel truth and Christian union was relentless—his hatred of all God's enemies intense: no language was too strong, no epithets too severe to express his emotions, or cover his adversary with shame and confusion. His was indeed the zeal of a king in Israel, destroying the groves and idols which had been consecrated to Baal; of a prophet threatening the judgments, proclaiming the wrath of heaven against all error and evil; nor wholly unlike the Master's when he addressed "a generation of vipers," or entering the temple, "drove out the money changers, and overturned the seats of them that sold doves." Like all men of great strength, he was urged on by the irrepressible conviction that it was at once both his duty and his office to humble the human will, and to awaken new and widespread feelings of devotion and praise to God, by proclaiming doctrines which God's word had revealed to his clear and certain knowledge. There was in his mind a marvellous union of all that was speculative, and all that was practical—the formal and exact blending of the objective and the subjective, in the development of his ideas and emotions. Election is certain, duty imperative; dependence is absolute and entire; obedience must be universal and unreserved; all good works to be done, and yet all merit to be renounced; sound doctrine proving itself by the fruits of holy living: the strictest self-discipline, and most self-denying love of souls: the integrity of faith, and the authority and order of the church. The more he thought of God's glory, the more he felt for man's welfare. The

deeper his conviction of God's purposes of grace and mercy, the more strenuous his endeavors at once to perfect holiness in himself, and to promote it in the hearts and lives of others. The more elevated his conceptions of God's sovereignty, the livelier his emotions of love and gratitude, and the more operative his sense of duty. The deeper his impression of the mystery of the will, the more earnestly did he call on man to act. Whatever metaphysical difficulty may be involved in his system, it was no bar to its moral tendency. Calvin himself was a living refutation of all popular objections to his system of doctrine; and it is a fact that his system has not only secured a higher stand to moral instruction than the Lutheran, but that it has given to moral science the most practical direction, while furnishing it with indisputable principles drawn from God's perfections and man's moral nature, and enlisting in its behalf a large number of the most profound moralists. There is an intimate connexion between one's theology and ethics. If the former be unscriptural, the latter will be nothing more than a system of expediency; or if the latter be founded in the eternal and immutable distinction between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, we may know that the God of the Bible is the authority of conscience. Calvin's system of morality was as pure as his system of doctrine was profound; of discipline strict, as his standard of piety was elevated; of order, as exact as the logic of his reasonings, or the economy of his household.

But let us see how and wherein he erred. He followed the bright track of his thought to the utmost verge of human intelligence, until he was lost in the incomprehensible mystery of the Divine purposes; and in like manner, he followed strictly, unhesitatingly, the dictates of his conscience, until he seemingly forgot that his conscience could not be a law for other men. It was not passion, but conscientiousness, ever active and intense, that sometimes betrayed him into extremes. This attribute of his spiritual nature explains, as Dr. Henry suggests, all the contrasts in his character and course. Here is the secret of his labors despite of bodily ailments, his attainments despite of interruptions, his thoughtfulness amid disturbances, his moderation amid insults, his humbleness of mind under every

temptation to spiritual pride. To this may philosophically be referred such facts as these, that he gave to study, and meditation, and prayer, those hours which most men lose by self-indulgence; that he was alike particular in all matters, whether great or small; as mindful of the good of the State, as of the prosperity of the church; opposed to war for the sake of the gospel, and yet opposed to peace for the sake of purity; that he exhorted the persecuted to remain faithful unto death, though he himself was removed from danger; that on his return from banishment, though the power was in his own hands, he did not expel the ministers whose hostility had occasioned his exile; that he used his influence with the Senate to restore Perrini, one of his bitterest enemies, to the seat from which he had been ejected, and obtained pardon for a woman who had openly vilified him, though the Council had resolved on her punishment; that he would not interfere with the temporal power, though true to the rightful authority of the church, nor suffer the temporal power to encroach on the spiritual; that when Geneva was threatened with a papal invasion to root out its heresy, he rose from his study table, and went forth to encourage, by his example, the erection of the city walls; that not until then, and but a few years before his death, did he avail himself of the right of citizenship, and become a burgher, because he had been all along anxious to avoid giving any color to the suspicion which had been wickedly suggested that he aimed after political power; and that though Geneva owed its position so much to his exertions, the moment he was disabled from work, he requested that his stipend should be withheld. Hence, too, his fearlessness in encountering any opposition, or meeting an adversary—his calm reply to the miscreants who attacked him on the bridge over the Rhone, that “it was broad enough for them all;” his abiding sense of his own unworthiness, his ascriptions of all praise to God’s grace, his free confession of his own frailties; most truly observing that “a man’s indiscretion will frequently urge him on in spite of his will.” But on the other hand, this very conscientiousness invested him at times with an air of gloom and austerity—created an impression that he was obstinate and self-willed, and that how-

ever truthful and sincere he might be, his zeal was more allied to fanaticism than to the spirit of Christianity.

He was right in relation to the great object of church discipline, which is to preserve the Lord's Supper from profanation and religion from discredit; greatly in advance of his age in insisting on the right and duty of the church to exclude from her communion all who, in her judgment, seemed unworthy of the privilege, and in not allowing the church to be subject to the State in matters which concern religion; and in laying down his moral code, he evinced a solicitude to guard the purity of the church, which we in vain look for in Luther's regulations; nor in giving up an offender to be punished by the Council did he act inconsistently with his own principles, for Dr. Henry (vol. i. p. 390) overlooks the fact that, being a theocrat, he aimed to make the civil power subservient to the legitimate ends of the spiritual; but his zeal necessarily occasioned a great public excitement, when he, in union with Farel and Conrad, declared that he could not administer the Lord's Supper in a city which would not submit itself to any kind of church discipline. No wonder that passions of every kind were excited, that the first families were at variance, and the city torn by parties. This step, however, was the origin of that whole system of discipline without which the church could not have continued; but no step could have been more unpopular, and he was obliged to leave the city in three days. He was right, moreover, in his views of ministerial responsibility, of Christian education, and of Christian character. Ministers should watch for souls, as they who must give an account; the baptized children of the church should be duly instructed, and guarded from evil, and may be the subjects of discipline; and though there may be a difference of view as to what is meant by worldly amusements, yet theatrical entertainments and midnight dances are at variance with that sobriety which becomes a Christian, and must be prejudicial to all spiritual attainments, and to all appropriate Christian influence: but Calvin's conscientiousness betrayed him into compulsory measures to effect ends which in themselves were scriptural and laudable; and though when Knox was in Geneva, he spoke with admiration of the good order of the church, and of Calvin,

as uniting with his severity a Christian heroism, a moderation and a gentleness in the discharge of his pastoral duties; yet it was not in human nature to look with pleasure on the power of a consistory which could hand one over to the Council to be punished even for some unbecoming word which had been overheard in the street; nor is it in accordance with scriptural views of the Lord's Supper to exclude or discipline one except for essential error, or some flagrant breach of Christian morality. There are evils which must be left to correct themselves, even as the frivolity of youth is sobered by age. Discipline in such matters can only prejudice, if not harden; but in Calvin's time, it exasperated not a few. Old families that, under the Catholic bishops, had been accustomed to an unrestrained mode of living, and had struggled for their political liberty, could not look with complacency on a man who seemed intent, by his discipline, to deprive them of their favorite amusements, and of the right to think and act as they pleased. Calvin's great practical mistake was in calling in the civil power to enforce church discipline for any offence, and much more for trifling misdemeanors. Men cannot be made good by compulsion. Under such circumstances, outward conformity with all church regulations and requirements is no proof that the heart is right in the sight of God, or that the ground of reliance is on Christ's merits, not on works. This element, so foreign to the very nature of all church power, was introduced through the Reformer's morbid solicitude for that *purity of doctrine* which he virtually deemed himself especially elected to uphold! But let him who has never acted under an illusion, even when he thought himself conscientious in his motives, who has never defeated his own ends, even when pursuing what he regarded as the path of duty, be the first to cast a stone at John Calvin, borne down by an oppressive sense of his duty to proclaim God's truth to a self-righteous world, and to restore order to his church.*

* Amid all his severities, however, he evinced great discrimination in all practical questions. For example: "Nothing can be better or more prudent than to avoid a frequent attendance at those scenes in which we must struggle with the world, unless we mean to betray the honor of God by an infamous cowardice. If, however, a person be present at a marriage, he ought to refrain from dancing; merely being present is not reprehensible, but we

Be it so, that Calvin was too rigid and severe. Luther would have been equally so, and much less calm, had he been placed in the same circumstances. This is painfully evident from the manner in which he treated Zwingle; but, in most instances, those with whom he had to deal were Papists, not Protestants, or there might to this day be similar prejudices against his memory in different sections of the Protestant church, as against Calvin himself. It was Calvin's infelicity to be constrained to protest against the views of some who had themselves protested against Rome, to differ from some who had the interests of the reformed church at heart as much as he; to reprove some who presumed on their authority, or countenanced what he thought wrong—even to say to such a man as Melancthon, who did not reject the modified Leipsig interim, "Vacillation in so great a man is not to be tolerated. I would a hundred times rather die with you, than see you survive a doctrine which you had betrayed." And still more unhappily for his popularity, Knox's theological views were known to agree with his own—Knox, whom Elizabeth hated, not less on account of his famous book against the government of women, than of his hostility to the Anglican church, for retaining some of the Catholic forms of worship. The haughty Queen never could be made to believe that Calvin had had no agency in Knox's rudely written work, though he himself aimed to disabuse her mind. She could hardly have been ignorant, too, of the fact that Calvin did not sympathize with the Scottish Reformer in his political views, though his own form of church government was strictly republican; and that in relation to

must take care not to offend others by our moral bearing. Let our sedateness act with the force of a severe censure. In relation to the question whether it be a duty to reprove foolish and wicked speeches, he replied, that "no rule can be given, but we should not let our anger be silent when a proper opportunity occurs for speaking. Prudence will often teach us to refrain. Still, when we are without tongues among such men, we should let them see, like righteous Lot, how much pain we suffer from their conduct," &c., &c. Vol. ii. p. 472. So in regard to ceremonies, he said to Knox, "You will moderate your zeal. We must take care to preserve the church free from all superstitious adornment, and must not suffer divine mysteries to be marred by childish additions; but holding this fast, do not forget that you must be ready to bear with some things which may not altogether please you."—Vol. ii. p. 332.

ceremonies his views were much more mild and moderate; but it was enough for her, that Knox venerated Calvin as a father, and looked to him, in many things, for counsel and guidance; that Calvin's doctrine and discipline, through his efforts, were making progress in Scotland; and the hatred with which she regarded the one was very naturally, though most unreasonably, extended to the other.

It comes not within our limits to designate all the causes of his unpopularity. Suffice it to say, that there is not a bad passion of the human heart, nor a selfish interest, that was not in turn, and at irregular intervals, arrayed to defeat his plans, or cripple his influence. But what rendered him still more obnoxious to the Romanists was, that they knew him to be the thinking head and the beating heart of the whole Protestant cause; while at the same time, in every conflict with error he was victorious. In nothing did he signally fail, but in his plan for the union of all the reformed churches, and in this, not for any want of energy, for, as he said to Cranmer, he "would readily have passed over ten seas to effect such an object;" but owing to misconceptions, which it was not in his power to preclude, to influences which no one mind could control. There was sufficient harmony in relation to essential principles; but some were swayed in their judgment by educational usages and national affinities, while others, notwithstanding the fact of their early agreement with the continental Reformers, on being subsequently raised to bishoprics, found it convenient to defer to royal predilections.

Had he been unsuccessful in his controversies with different individuals, he would have been more readily pardoned for any indiscretions of which he might have been guilty; but the reverse was the case to a remarkable extent, and in some instances, to the mortification and implacable malice of the party defeated; though in other instances, ultimately to a candid acknowledgment of both error and wickedness. Troillet, on his death-bed, sent for Calvin, and declared that he could not feel peace unless assured of his forgiveness; and Calvin consoled the dying man, and with peculiar earnestness and tenderness, supported him to the last moment. Zebedæus, who had persecuted him so virulently, confessed on his death-bed the truth of the doctrine which

he had assailed, and to testify his repentance desired that all his own controversial papers should be burnt before his eyes. The world has been wont to look on him "as a dialectician, passionately engaged in unfolding one idea," but as Henry remarks, it is "the religious feeling that was the sublimest element in his doctrine as well as in his intellect;" this determined his course, herein is the secret of his amazing power; and, in the instances to which we have alluded, we see the consciences of his dying opponents bearing witness to the fact that Calvin had been impelled to the course which he had adopted by the Spirit of God himself. What, short of the mighty workings of that blessed Agent, could have wrought in him such a conviction of the truth, could have guarded him against a solitary doubt, and secured to him victory against fearful odds? With an intellect so gigantic, a strength of purpose nothing human could either daunt or divert, energetic in speech, and untiring in action, he sometimes reminds us of Sir Artegall's iron man Talus, who went everywhere trampling down and crushing all opposers. But when we think of the sources whence were drawn his mind's conclusions and his soul's aliment, and see him with that extended hand, offering his burning heart to God, and hear him declare the whole counsel of God, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, and then contemplate the vast results of his labors, we cannot but recognise in him a special messenger from God for great and solemn ends—a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, wielding the two-edged sword of the Spirit, and mighty through God to the pulling down of the strongholds of antichrist and his legions. What he himself said of Luther, may be as truly said of him: "It is not Luther that has spoken: God has sent forth his lightnings by his mouth."

This system of doctrine was the opposite of papal belief, contrary to the reasonings of the mind of the flesh, at variance with priestcraft, with will-worship, with superstition, with the pride of reason, with the pride of life, with the love of sin, of self and the world; most humbling to man's will; not to be practically embraced without the entire submission of mind and heart, to the teachings and requisitions of God's word. It might have been clothed in language less theological and less metaphysical; it might have been modified

in some of its features without impairing its just proportions; it might have been more guarded in some of its points without compromising its integrity; it might have been couched in forms less repellent to a refined taste, and more intelligible to minds undisciplined to habits of thought; but essentially it is scriptural, and philosophically unanswerable. Amid the various systems of theology, where is there one which in depth and earnestness, in acumen and force, in its consistency, and in its relevancy to the great facts of God's government and man's condition, will compare with Calvin's "Institutes?" Where one that has been so often assailed by keen wits and rancorous tongues, but so seldom met in fair and dispassionate controversy? And how many minds, either swayed by prejudice, misled by fancy, or desirous of self-distinction for independent thought, have at last, through their humble study of the Scriptures, their conscious need of mercy and grace, their inability to fathom the deep things of God, to explain the melancholy phenomena of this world by the light of reason, or to find rest without reposing in child-like faith on the word and promises of that God who cannot err and cannot do wrong, who must be true to his own high and holy perfections in all the sovereign councils of his own will,—yes, have at last waived their theories, repressed their presumptuous thoughts, mortified their pride, and embraced that system of doctrine which has its root in the fact that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament comprise and constitute the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

Were there a more cordial sympathy with high and serious thought, or were that system with which his name is identified, not repugnant to the sensual judgment, Calvin, as a *thinker*, would occupy no obscure niche in the pantheon of intellect. His "Institutes," written at the age of twenty-five, and under circumstances most unfavorable to quiet study; when, too, there were comparatively few to read, fewer to appreciate, and crowds to condemn and execrate, is the most extraordinary product of the human mind. The attainments of a scholar, the discrimination of a critic, the reflection of a philosopher, the order of a logician, and the words of a rhetorician, in union with the faith, and hope, and deep breathings of a Christian, all are comprised within this work

to give exactness to its positions, closeness to its arguments, solidity to its proofs, strength to its language, and weight to its conclusions. All false systems of religion have their origin in false views of God, and end in ascribing to the creature the glory due only to the Creator. With the most elevated conceptions of God's nature and perfections, with the most adoring sense of his sovereign claims on man's love and obedience, Calvin shows man what he has lost, what he is, what he can never regain, what he can never be, without God's mercy and grace vouchsafed to those who are the called according to his purpose; and ending where he begins, ascribes "all glory and honor, dominion and power, thanksgiving and blessing and praise unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb that was slain." How could a system be regarded with favor which stripped popery of its impious pretensions, tore off the veil from sanctimonious hypocrisy, exposed falsehood and fraud, heartless forms and sham gods, laid all human merit in the dust; and which, holding up the glass of God's word, revealed to all error and infidelity, to all self-righteousness and worldliness, the insidious working of that "carnal mind which is enmity against God." Such a system could have been welcomed only by those into whose minds God had shone, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of himself in the face of Jesus Christ." Everywhere, without the little pale of the reformed churches, it awakened the most determined hostility. But it was destined to survive the perversions of errorists, the calumnies of the godless, and the proscriptions of enthroned iniquity, destined to work mighty changes in the world, and to secure to its author an influence which few uninspired men have ever exerted. The impress of his mind may be recognised in every confession of the reformed churches, in the "Thirty-nine Articles," which Elizabeth herself subscribed, as in the Catechism which was drawn up in all solemnity by the assembled divines at Westminster. His influence was felt, is felt, and will be, down to the last syllable of recorded time, in the state, as in the church; and to counteract it if possible, and prejudice his system of doctrine, *his memory has been branded with the fate of Servetus.*

Now, on the supposition that Calvin had fired the pyre to

which this unhappy man was bound, and gloated over his ashes, it would not affect the question as to the intrinsic merits of his doctrinal views. There is a sense in which a man may be better or worse than his theoretic principles—may be practically good in spite of his false system, or bad in spite of the truths which he professedly adopts. If one is at last guilty of a crime, it does not follow that he was brought up under erroneous views, though the early inculcation of right notions is so important to an upright and virtuous life; and much less does a man's lapse from purity constitute a valid argument against the truth of the gospel which he might have professed to believe, and even aimed to inculcate. Inconsistencies necessarily prejudice the general mind against religion, but the Bible stands on its own merits, apart from the conduct of its professed adherents. If Calvin, therefore, became a persecutor, it does not follow that Calvinism is allied to persecution or breathes a gloomy and malignant spirit; and the most that can with logical propriety be said of him in this relation is, that in his unquestioning deference to existing statutes, his educational concurrence with the popular sentiment respecting the punishment of heretics, and in his horror of blasphemy, he lost sight of the essential spirit of that gospel to the preaching and defence of which he had devoted his life. A Calvinist in doctrinal belief can be neither a tyrant nor a slave. With the Bible for the foundation of his creed, he knows that as no man has a right to bind his conscience, so he himself has no right to bind the conscience of any other man; that every man is a free, moral agent, personally responsible to God alone for what he believes and does, and that it is not by might, nor by power, that the cause of truth is to be advanced, but by God's *Spirit*; that while all error and disbelief spring from an evil heart, faith is the gift of God, not a something into which man can be either cajoled, or terrified, either inveigled by sophistry, or driven by authority, or frightened by cruelty. No system is to be condemned on account of the acts of which some of its advocates may have been guilty; no class of men are to be judged from individual instances. But here is the wide difference between Calvinists and Romanists—the former have long since been enabled to perceive that no power on earth has a right to

enforce the decrees of the church, while the latter are still to a great degree in bondage to the fear of ghostly power; here is the greater difference between the "Institutes" of Calvin, and the "Constitutions" of Loyola—the former favor, the latter oppose all scriptural inquiries; the former welcome all the light that can be poured on the sacred page by the aid of either literature or science, of history or of philosophy—the latter exclude the Bible itself, and bring all views to the test, not of God's word, but of the Pope's decrees. Doubtless there are some Romanists who cannot think without horror of the bloody and infernal deeds which stain the annals of the Papacy—the wholesale massacre of unnumbered men and women, guilty of no other crime than faith in Christ; but Jesuits now, are even as Jesuits were—the same enemies of civil and religious liberty—the same deadly foes of a free Bible; at this very day, wherever the civil power is in their hands—as is so evident from the imprisonment of the *Madiai*, persecuting as of yore all who dare to read God's word contrary to their commands! So long as Popery claims to be infallible, and claims as of right the sword of the magistrate, as well as the tiara of the priest, all dissent from its dogmas must necessarily, and in perfect consistency with its principles, be at the hazard of liberty and life. It is not surprising that the Reformers should have been alarmed by the brood of heresies which rushed in through the very door of freedom which they had opened for the truth's sake. Men who had been wont to witness the power of the magistrate in the suppression of the truth, might very naturally have thought that some such power was needed to exclude and preclude pernicious errors. Time was necessary, yea, a long and bitter discipline in its conflicts with the powers of the world, before the church could attain the conclusion, that the temporal power is necessary neither to the arrest of heresy nor to the spread of truth. It is priestcraft that needs the aid of the sword, not the ministry of the word; a system founded in the lust of dominion and gain, not one founded on the apostles and prophets, of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone. The more liberty and the more light, so much the better for the one, but the worse for the other—Bible-truth has everything to gain, Popery, all to lose!

Still, we cannot contemplate the scene which has suggested such a train of remark, without a shuddering recoil. Even at this distant day we could drop a tear over the spot which marks the grave of Servetus. Not that he was a good man, for in the judgment of Bucer and Capito, of Œcolampadius and Zwingli, he was rather a "manifestation of Satan"; not that his errors were insignificant and harmless—far from it; not that his conduct during his trial bore any resemblance to the heroic bearing of a Christian martyr—on the contrary, it was calculated to alienate and disgust; nor because he died calling on God and Christ, for in the lips of a man who had once woven a web of falsehoods to prove that he was not Servetus but Villeneuve, who contradicted before his judges at Geneva what he had stated to his judges at Vienne—such ejaculations are no criteria of faith: nor do we feel thus because he was consciously a martyr to freedom of conscience, for he himself, as well as Westphal, thought and admitted that obstinate heretics ought to be punished with loss of life; but because Servetus was amenable to God and not to man for his belief, because God's prerogative was invaded by the order for his death; because the men who were concerned in his sentence were men solemnly pledged to a cause which repudiates all carnal weapons—the professed followers of Him who had said, "They that use the sword shall perish by the sword;" because they were themselves Protestants; and they obstructed the very cause which they hoped to advance, and they have given occasion to God's enemies to blaspheme. As we dwell on the painful occurrence, we involuntarily say to ourselves, Is there then no difference between the spirit of Protestantism and that of Popery? Will all men persecute if they only have rule? Why should they who so scrupulously avoided Rome in her games and farces, have imitated Rome in her intolerance and cruelties? How could men who were themselves in danger of being burnt for differing from the Pope, burn others for differing from Calvin? Would that that bloody scene had never been enacted! Would that it could be blotted from the page of history! But no; let it be—it has been overruled for wise ends—let it be pondered time and again; the lesson which it teaches cannot be too deeply engraven on all who hold to the great principles of Bible truth.

We maintain, however, that it warrants no legitimate deduction against Calvin's system of doctrine, or his disposition as a man—against him, any more than against the temper and creed of the other Reformers; while it admits of a reasonable explanation in perfect consistency with their character, as men who aimed in all things to do what they thought to be their duty.

As to the act itself, it was performed with feelings very unlike those which actuated the Romish Inquisitors when they consigned a poor Protestant to the flames: there was no insult offered—no vindictive exultation, nor intentional effort to protract and exaggerate suffering; but all was sadness, piety, and the kindest efforts to soothe, as well as reclaim, before the fatal moment. It was certainly not as indicative of the absence of all justice, all humanity, as ten thousand instances of papal cruelty, refined by every instrument of torture which hellish malignity could invent; nor was it more abhorrent to every rightful sentiment of our nature than the burning of Ann Askew, Joanna Bocher, and George Paris, to which Cranmer was accessary, or of Legate and Wightman, in which King and Neile, two bishops under James I., were directly concerned; and still less so, considering all the circumstances of the case, than the ten years' imprisonment and final decapitation of Krell, who, having become an object of suspicion on account of his Calvinistic notions, fell at last the victim of Lutheran intolerance. (Vol. ii. p. 237.) Nor, notwithstanding the acrimony with which Arminians have regarded all that savors of Calvinism, did the act differ in principle from the ejection of the two thousand ministers from the church of England because they could not conscientiously conform to what they regarded as Popish usages! Let the records of the Star Chamber be blotted out from history before Oxford sits in judgment on the Councils of Geneva; let the execution at Dresden in 1591 be buried in oblivion before Lutherans cry out against Calvin; aye, and let the fate of Servetus be disproved before Protestants cease to make allowance for those who, believing that all civil as well as ecclesiastical power was vested in the Pope, thought no punishment too heavy for the revilers of Christ's representative on earth!

The treatment to which Servetus was subjected was what

we call, and justly regard, as the most odious and cruel persecution; but in his times it was deemed right and necessary for the safety of the church, and the interests of truth, to make heresy a capital offence. The law demanded the punishment of the heretic, and the public opinion of even the reformed church sanctioned it. None of the Reformers questioned Rome's right to punish heresy. It was not that Rome burnt the heretics, that they demurred; it was that Rome called them heretics who read and believed God's word, and whose sentiments were more in accordance with the primitive fathers, than with the decrees of their own councils. For this very reason, to convince the Catholic powers that they were laboring under an awful delusion, that all the objects of their virulent persecution were neither fools nor fanatics, neither infidels nor malignants; to stay the shedding of innocent blood, by proving to them what the fathers believed and what God's word taught, was Calvin urged to write and publish the "Institutes." He himself was not opposed to all freedom of opinion, but only to what was wilfully designed for the destruction of the faith, and hence he said that he would be willing to be himself burnt if convicted of heresy. Luther sometimes expressed himself most nobly in favor of toleration, yet he was most intolerant towards the Sacramentarians; he even expressed it as his opinion to Philip of Hesse, that it was lawful to inflict capital punishment on heretics; and we find him assenting to the question of the Wittenberg theologians, "Whether it was lawful to punish the Anabaptists with the sword?" Even Melancthon was of the same opinion in relation to awful errors. But Bullinger, who stood so high in the estimation of the English exiles, said to Calvin,

"I know that many have wished that you had not defended this principle, but many also thank you, and among others our church. Urbanus Regius has long ago proved, in a work of his own, and all the ministers of Lunenburg agree with him, that heretics, when they are blasphemous, ought to be punished. There are also many other pious men who think the same, and consider that such offenders ought not only to be silenced, but to be put to death. I know that your disposition is not cruel, and that you will favor no barbarity. Who knows not that a boundary must be set to things of this kind?"

And as they thought that so heinous an offender against all that is true and sacred as Servetus had proved himself to be, ought not to go unpunished, so they felt that if they did not condemn him, they would give just occasion to the Catholics to say, "See to what this Protestantism leads—the overthrow of all order and all religion." To condemn him was, in their view, to publish to the world that while all blasphemy should be punished, they who held to the principles of the gospel, no matter whether they retained their connexion with the papacy or not, whether they were Lutherans or Calvinists, ought not to be treated as heretics, and were not so in fact.

Now in order to understand this case, and to attain to a right judgment in relation to Calvin's agency in the premises, it is necessary to observe, that Servetus was not decoyed to Geneva. He was a fugitive from justice, had been proclaimed an outlaw, had entered Geneva in disguise and of his own accord; and if Calvin informed the Council that he was lurking in the suburbs, it was only what he thought to be his duty to the Republic, and what every other good citizen, knowing the dangerous character of the man, would have done. It is to be observed, moreover, that Servetus had his choice whether to be tried at Geneva or at Vienne; that his decision in favor of the former probably arose from his hope that the libertine party would sway the councils of the state; that Perrini, the leader of the party, at the time when Servetus stood most in need of his influence, for four days represented himself to be sick, and that with him the enemies of the church weakly retreated. It is not improbable that they themselves, notwithstanding their opposition to Calvin, saw that Servetus had gone to too great lengths—liberal as they were, that his sentiments were too extreme even for them to endorse; that by his own irrational violence, abuse, and blasphemy, he was prejudicing his own case, and fast turning the sympathies of both the judges and the people into sentiments of indignation and horror at his conduct; for the extremely liberal in those days might have been not very dissimilar from the same class in our days: always more forward to sympathize in general than in particular, to vaunt themselves on their detestation of all that is bigoted, and opposed to progress, than to hazard their own personal

interests by defending what has at last become unpopular and is seen to be disreputable. Instead of defending Servetus in a firm, manly way, it does not appear that the libertine party did anything more than to inspire him with false hopes, and incite him to attack Calvin in a most virulent manner; while if anything can be established by the testimony in the case it is that the accused, in the course of his examination, dismissed all regard for truth and propriety, ridiculed things holy, blasphemed God, outraged every pious sentiment. A man who should now act in a court of justice as Servetus did before the Genevan council, would not only turn the general mind against him, but be remanded to prison.

A most weighty interest seemed to be involved in his trial; the existence of the civil polity was inseparably connected with that of the church; the downfall of the latter would be the destruction of the former: the defeat of the reformed faith would be the restoration of the Catholic with all its despotism and all its superstitions; and this explains the action of the Genevan council in the case. They could not be indifferent to the propagation of sentiments which were alike ruinous to the state and to the church; and the Spaniards' views were fatal to all that they deemed just and necessary, sacred and true. He stood before them self-convicted of effrontery, contradiction, falsehood—of the most awful blasphemy and impiety—as it were the enemy of God and man. There is, perhaps, great allowance to be made for him during his trial; for, under the influence of his advisers, he might have thought, as is often exemplified in the conduct of radicals, that violence might effect what calm discussion would defeat; or, through his bitter disappointment that Protestants did not necessarily sympathize with a man whom Rome had denounced, he might have been exasperated to say things which in another mood he would not have thought of uttering, and especially, all that he regarded as most abhorrent from Calvinism, and most offensive to Calvin; or, through his conscious inability to maintain his position, his pride might have beclouded his judgment, and his passions—for he had the characteristics of his nativity—might have staggered his reason. Nevertheless, he had no cause to complain that he had not had a

fair trial. Nicholas de la Fontaine, Calvin's secretary, came forth as his accuser, though fully aware of the law which would subject him to the consequences of a false accusation, if the accused was found innocent; and when he was seen to be unequal to the task of confronting such a man, all the ministers were requested to appear, nor was it till then that Calvin confronted his adversary. It was a principle with him that "punishment ought only to be inflicted when a trial had been regularly instituted, and the heresy well defined, and not according to the course pursued by the Papists, who murder the innocent," very unlike Westphal in this respect, who called every one a heretic that differed from him in opinion. Yet Calvin had no intention to expose Servetus to capital punishment. (Vol. ii. p. 187.) It even appears from Trie's letter, that Calvin, as he bore not the sword of justice, thought his duty confined him to the simple task of opposing heresies by the force of truth alone; and, hence, he only wished to render him harmless, to make him recant his blasphemy, and so preserve Christianity from injury. Accordingly, he waited long; gave Servetus ample time to collect and tranquillize his thoughts; and when he was in prison, furnished him out of his own library with pens, ink, and paper, and whatever books he desired. There is no proof of the assertion that he increased the severity of the prisoner's treatment, for it was not his duty to superintend the prison; much less that he aimed to precipitate measures. On the contrary, he willingly carried on the dispute in writing, that all excitement might be avoided, while an indefinite time was allowed to the accused, so that he might retract what he found wrong, and rectify any perversion of his meaning. And that the case, after so many examinations, and so long a time, was not referred to the "Council of Two Hundred," was not owing to Calvin, but to the Council, who, for sufficient reasons, saw fit to reject a petition which had been instigated by a faction whose object was to set aside the right of excommunication, and all the rules of discipline.

View it in whatever light, it was in every respect the opposite of what Romanists termed a trial for heresy; the accused was a blasphemer, not a confessor; his opinions were opposed, not conformable to the Bible; at variance

with all faith, not the faith of papists; with the inspiration and authority of the Bible, as well as the standards and order of the reformed church. But it were inconsistent with our limits to enter into all particulars, or attempt to refute the various invidious representations which have been made of this case to throw odium on Calvin. Let it be borne in mind, that the council of "The Sixty," as well as the lesser council, were of one opinion, that Servetus ought to be condemned; that the Roman judges who carried on their proceedings against him, as though he had not escaped, did not come to a decision until after he had been condemned at Geneva, and that they then declared him to be an arch-heretic; that Calvin aimed to procure the opinion of all the reformed churches in the premises; and that the condemnation of Servetus was approved of in the most unequivocal manner by all the prominent Reformers, not excepting Melancthon himself, who said to Calvin, "I am wholly of your opinion, and also declare that your magistrates, the entire proceeding having been conducted according to law, acted quite justly in condemning the blasphemer to death." Even the Bernese, who only two years before had favored Bolsec, and rebuked Calvin for having in his zeal for sound doctrine forgotten the claims of Christian love, telling him that "people should be brought back to the truth with gentleness, not with severity or with bonds," now agreed with him in relation to Servetus. Indeed, without subjecting himself to the charge of disregarding the law and countenancing blasphemy, he could not have done otherwise than he did. His part was simply that of a public prosecutor, and had not the case been so glaring, it is certain that Servetus would not have been condemned. His personal influence with the Council was at the time less than it had ever been; and what proves the fact, and also serves to vindicate him from the charge of fanaticism, is, that as soon as he heard that the Assembly in its zeal had gone too far, he called the ministers together, and they, with one voice, besought the council to soften the mode of execution. Be it known, then, that Calvin was opposed to the burning of Servetus, though he, in unison with the councils and with the leaders of the reformed churches, was in favor of his condemnation to death; so satisfied were all in their own minds that blas-

phemy ought to be punished by the magistrate, and that Servetus had been guilty of the most awful crime. Death was the penalty of blasphemy under the Old Testament, and though this may have influenced the judgment of some as to the nature of the punishment to which the criminal should be subjected, yet the civil judges could decide only according to the law of the land; and that law by which Servetus was condemned, be it remembered, the old law against blasphemers, continued in force another century and a half, even in Protestant countries. Be it so that no law of the kind can justify the act: still it enables us to account for it; and so may it be accounted for in after times, that not a few in our day can be swayed by laws which are not in accordance with the gospel.

Yet, notwithstanding the existence of such a law, the voice of the councils, the concurrence of the churches, and the most decided expression of opinion on the part of the most worthy of his contemporaries, in relation to the crime and its merited punishment, all the blame of this man's condemnation, has been visited on Calvin. Cranmer was a Christian, and Laud a saint, but Calvin was a monster! And all because of one remark which occurs in a letter to Farel, "That if he should come to Geneva, he would never allow him, supposing his influence to be worth anything, to depart alive!" (Vol. ii. p. 181.) But Servetus had asked whether it would be safe for him to go to Geneva: and if Calvin had been vindictive in his feelings towards him, why did he not influence him to come? It is folly to say that he would then have been guilty of falsehood, as if a man who was intent on murder would hesitate to lie. It was probably, then, as Henry suggests, an ebullition of passion; and he would, if possible, deter him from coming to Geneva, or give him emphatically to understand that if he came with such opinions, his death would be just and necessary, according to law, and for the interests of the republic. No one word can be offset against the whole tenor of one's life and teachings; and this is so inconsistent with the letter written the same day to another person, expressive of his deep desire for Servetus's conversion, so inconsistent with his wonted superiority to personal injury, and with all his views and feelings consequent on the issue of his case, that

no candid mind can interpret it as the deliberate expression of a malignant and bloodthirsty purpose. Had such been his feelings towards the misguided man, he had never labored so long and earnestly to bring him to a sense of his sins and errors, never visited him after he knew that the law would take its course, never had peace after Servetus's death; nor with a mind so enlightened with the knowledge of the truth could he have died in peace. But what are the facts? Never did man exert himself with more moderation and patience to convince another of his errors, than Calvin Servetus. Never did man address an enemy with more Christian propriety than Calvin in his last interview with Servetus. The latter had sent for him desiring his forgiveness. "I readily answered, and it was strictly the truth, that I had never sought to resent any personal affront received from him. I also tenderly reminded him that, sixteen years before, I had diligently sought, at the hourly peril of my own life, to win him to the Lord; that it was not my fault that all pious people had not extended the hand of friendship towards him, and that this would have been the case had he but shown some degree of judgment; that although he had taken to flight, I had still continued to correspond peaceably with him; that, in a word, no duty of kindness had been neglected on my part, till, embittered by my free and candid writings, he had resigned himself not merely to a feeling of anger, but to absolute wrath, against me." He then besought him, but in vain, to implore the Divine forgiveness; and his allusions to him, after the final scene, though few, were such as became one who could not but sigh to think of his unhappy end, but who hoped that he might never be called again to so painful a duty.

As to his own death, it was eminently peaceful; in perfect keeping with a life which had been devoted to the cause of truth—in unison with the aspirations of a soul overflowing with sentiments of love to God and good will for man. A spectacle for angels, a lesson for the world, a scene in the history of that period never to be forgotten; such as all who sympathize with the great principles of the Reformation must ever view with admiration and gratitude—such as his enemies, even to this day, cannot steadily contemplate without secretly wishing that their own end may be like his.

Infidelity may blunt the finer sensibilities of the soul; bigotry may avert its glance; fanaticism may shout for joy, and relying on the worst passions of our nature, proclaim a day of thanksgiving, when the interests of religion call on all Christian men to moan and weep; but as truly as there is a God above us, and the Bible is his written word, there, in that study of his, where he had so often kneeled in solitary prayer, and his mind had so long tasked its energies for the cause of truth—there, on that couch, with the hue of death upon his face, yet with a voice collected and distinct, and his hand pointed to that Holy Book by his side, as he addresses, for the last time, the syndics and senators who have gathered round him in sadness and silence—there is an illustrious example of all that is commanding in intellect, noble in purpose, sincere in faith, and glorious in hope! It speaks to us of all that is worth living for—worth dying for! It tells us, too, how we must live, if we would so die; supported to the last by an unfaltering trust, and to the last glorifying God; leaving to the church our works of faith, to the world our testimony to truth; lying down in a grave that needs no stone to perpetuate the remembrance of a name so clearly inscribed in the Lamb's Book of Life.

We are no worshippers of men. We see perfection nowhere save in the God-man Jesus. We look for unadulterated truth nowhere save in God's own book. While we retain the integrity of our moral faculty, we can call no man master. Calvin's name, deeply as we respect it, is without weight to us in all matters of faith, unless we are satisfied with Calvin's reason. Our faith must stand, not on the authority of man, but of God. Yet, at the time of which we write, God's word had been enchained, and great and good men there were in different countries, and under different circumstances, who searched and inquired diligently to ascertain the mind of the Spirit, who had found Him of whom the prophets wrote, and found peace in Him, who loved his cause and loved nothing but his cause; and if Calvin held such "monstrous doctrines," how happened it that such men recognised him as one with themselves? If his agency in the death of Servetus merits such unmeasured reprehension, how is it to be accounted for, that his influence throughout the churches was greater after that event

than it had ever been before? If there was any lack of judgment, of integrity, of kindness, why should the persecuted everywhere have looked to him for sympathy, and counsel, and aid? Abundant evidence may be gathered from his letters, and from his friendships, that he was a man to be beloved as well as feared. But when we come to form an opinion of him as he was through all his life, whose testimony should we value? that of a "Balduin" or of a "Beza?" a Bolsec or a Bullinger? Let the difference in the character and courses of these opposing witnesses answer. Men who could twist and turn as circumstances demanded, and in the end rejoin the Papists, might be expected to propagate falsehoods as senseless as they were shameless; and Bolsecs and Balduins may still be found, and men tenacious of ghostly rule and pompous rites; still, we cannot forget that they who knew him best praised him the most; that a man of so much loveliness and cultivation as Melancthon expressed the highest esteem for "the candor and purity of his soul," "rested his weary head on Calvin's shoulder, and would fain have died so resting;" that Spina, whose own veneration for the Reformer could not have been surpassed, testifies, from his own personal knowledge, to the admiration and affection with which he was regarded by many, on account of the noble endowments with which God had enriched him; and, above all, that Beza, the learned, the noble, the accomplished Beza, who had so long been associated with him in different relations, had seen him, and heard him, under all circumstances, and in whose arms he died, bedewed his grave with tears. There was deep mourning throughout the city when it was announced that Calvin was dead, and there were many that came to take their last look of that strongly marked face; and the patricians, and almost all the citizens, followed on, not without many tears, to the place where all that was mortal of him was unostentatiously and silently laid; and the council carried away with them from that simple grave an impression of the majesty of Calvin's character, such as rendered them firm to the truth; but they who had prized the Bible above all price—they, in whose bosoms the principles of the glorious Reformation had awakened the spirit of a new life, and who had no interest separate from the cause of truth—alone knew and felt what a spirit had

passed from earth ! what a loss the church had sustained ! so great a loss, we cannot be surprised that the enemies of the Reformation should have rejoiced and taken courage, and aimed to effect what they had known to be hopeless, so long as Calvin breathed the breath of life.

To estimate him aright, then, we must take into consideration the age in which he lived, the circumstances in which he was placed, the difficulties with which he had to contend, and the disadvantages under which he labored. He who, so early in life, and amid the moral darkness of the times, could so quickly discover the right mode of interpreting Scripture, so systematize the truths of the Reformation, so distinguish the various shades of error, so accompany each position with the necessary proofs, thus furnishing a defence against assault, and informing the whole system of dogmatics with the light of life, and the power of a living faith, must have been endued with the gifts and graces of a Divine Spirit, as well as endowed with extraordinary natural powers ; and even to this day, but few, though not in all points agreeing with the author of the "Institutes," will dissent from Scaliger's judgment : *Solus inter theologos Calvinus*. He, too, who could take so prominent a part in framing those civil and religious laws to which Geneva owed her prosperity, whom her Council was wont to charge with numerous weighty affairs, who was consulted on so many important subjects, who was as faithful in the discharge of all pastoral duties as he was true and punctual to the demands of his pulpit, who exemplified his appreciation of sound learning as an auxiliary to the cause of pure Christianity, by founding an academy to which scholars thronged from all parts of Europe ; who formed and sent forth preachers of the Word, found time not only to controvert various errors, but to translate most of his own learned works himself ; who wrote almost with as much quickness as he spoke, and generally spoke with as much precision and force as he wrote—whose correspondence, embracing as it does some twelve hundred letters, extended all over Europe ; whose counsels were valued and whose influence was felt throughout all the churches of the Reformation, could not have been a gloomy fanatic, nor a mere dialectician, void of all heart and principle. If, to ordinary discernment, our conclusion seems

unnecessarily positive, let the malicious perversions to which the facts in his history, the sarcastic insinuations of his political, ecclesiastical, and theological opponents, not to speak of the ridicule which all voluptuaries have been wont to pour on his discipline, be our apology.

Calvin's life is to be taken as a whole—his character viewed in its just proportions. If he was strict and rigid, he required in others no more than he had sternly imposed on himself. If he sought to reduce the order of his own church to the model of the Synagogue, he could allow others to observe different forms of church government, so long as the pure word of God was preached, and the sacraments rightfully administered. If he could not always agree with others, in relation to minor points, he could in spirit with all who adhered to fundamental principles; if error could not escape his detection, nor wrong his censure, truth was always welcomed and worth acknowledged; and though he seemed often so involved in personal difficulties, yet was he never unmindful of the trials of others, nor inattentive to the welfare of any section of the church: though his enemies have regarded him as unyielding, unfeeling, self-opinionated, dogmatic—bent on power and rule, yet no nobler friendship ever existed than that which he enjoyed with some of the choicest spirits of the age, and no one more than he bemoaned the loss of his contemporary laborers, as one after another, in different countries, they sank into the grave.

That he had his infirmities of temper, no one knew better or could regret more than himself. That he seems to have had no romantic imaginativeness, is also true; but neither had Paul, nor Howard, nor many others, who have been intent on great and serious ends. There were no intervals of recreation for Calvin's mind—no summer days of lounging indolence—no vacant moods in which the eye wanders in quest of mere refreshment: life with him was all in-door thought, and out-door action—the senses, all were in subjection to the will within, and that, with its strong, unwavering purpose, aimed at one grand end—rendering him indifferent to all else, allowing him no leisure for aught else—and yet, strange as it may seem, his belief in the ministry of angels enriched for him both life and nature, and the abiding

thought that Heaven was looking down on him, animated the whole world to his apprehension. For similar reasons, no trace of sentimentality can be detected in either his conversations or his writings. All we meet with bears on life's sad realities, and duty's painful conflicts, and eternity's solemn interests—the nature, the tests, the toils, the trials, and the results of faith in Christ, in the midst of an age of disbelief, and delusion, and spiritual wickedness, and persecuting power. Let those who would be captivated by fancy, or melted to tears of morbid sorrow, or amused in their hours of vacancy, look anywhere else than to the life of John Calvin—a man whose whole course was but a practical exemplification of the principle which he laid down for all with whom he was associated: *Let us so live to Christ that we may be every day prepared to die for him!* and who, when besought by Beza, to refrain at least during his sickness from dictating and writing, answered—*Would you that the Lord should find me idle when he comes?*

With a view, however, most effectually to disparage both Calvin and his system in popular estimation, it is common with a certain class to advert with malicious glee to the fact that Geneva has departed from the Reformer's principles, and that the church in which he preached has, in our time, renounced all confessions of faith. But has not the church of England proved false to her own doctrinal articles—England that once during the 16th century persecuted all who did not hold to Calvinistic principles? Is not Oxford at this very day false to the principles of her own Reformation from Popery? Has not Rome herself, in defiance of the constitution and the sovereignty of England, but safely reckoning on the acquiescence, if not the approbation of the English Ministry, created a *bishopric* of BIRMINGHAM, and an *archbishopric* of WESTMINSTER? Or, confining our view to our own land—the land of the *Pilgrims*; what do we see but the encroachments of the man of sin? The voice of the JESUIT has even been heard in the very temple of Washington! That voice, for aught we know, may yet sway the councils of our nation to the overthrow of our free institutions! The sepulchre of Jesus was once in the possession of Infidels! But this does not prove that Jesus of Nazareth was not a prophet sent of God, or that his sayings

are not the *true sayings of God*. Nor does the revival of Popery, or the mission of Jesuitism, disprove the principles of the great Reformation. And though Rousseau may have been apotheosized on the very spot where three centuries ago Calvin was in the ascendant, his system of doctrine has the same foundation that it had then, and this is open to the inspection, while it defies the scrutiny of the world. By the Bible, therefore, is the truth or falsity of Calvinism to be determined, not by the existence of rationalism in Geneva, any more than by Puseyism in Exeter, or Jesuitism in Plymouth. By the nature of its influence is it to be judged, by the appropriate tendency of its now more fully defined, and clearly understood, and philosophically consistent principles, not by the existence of errors and evils inseparable from that freedom which, through its faith in God's word, it has at last wrought out for the world, and prizes no less for others than for itself.

It were easy to show how Calvin's exegetical method awakened a spirit of inquiry; how that excessive love of mental independence which characterizes our times, and has led to so many errors and abuses, may have originated in that very habit of inquiry which Calvin himself inspired; and it would be profitable as well as interesting to trace the actual influence of Calvinism in all Protestant countries; but suffice it to say in this connexion, that whatever may have been the failings and abuses of Calvinism, the secret of that influence which it wields, lies in the logical exactness of thought and force of argument with which it at once propounds and supports the great principles of Christian doctrine. Its essential condition is unreserved submission of the mind, the will, the heart, the conscience, to the teachings of the inspired word; its growth and development is in proportion to the knowledge of this word, and faith in its discoveries, and obedience to its requisitions, and hope in its promises; its influence, in the exposition of its doctrines, the inculcation of its precepts and the application of its truths to all classes and conditions, to all relations and interests, by men spiritually called, intellectually trained, and regularly set apart; who, by their own deep convictions of its truth, and blessed experience of its adaptedness to the wants and woes of their nature, count all things but loss for the excel-

lency of its knowledge, admit of no other authority in matters of faith, render all other departments of knowledge tributary to its defence and illustration, that they be the honored instruments, in God's hands, of planting its divine origin in the world's conscience, and of bringing the world at last to bow to the sceptre of Him whose right alone it is to reign.

Be it so, that in the Geneva of this day no trace of Calvinism should be found; there is none of Christianity itself even where the church of Christ was first planted: yet wherever the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments are rightly administered, and the Spirit's influences are felt to be essential to the great work of repentance and faith, and spiritual union with all who hold the Head is admitted and cherished, there is Calvinism. Wherever there is a church, no matter by what name it may be distinguished, which in its doctrine, order, and discipline, is removed from Popery and conformed to the principles of the apostolic church, there is Calvinism, because there is Christianity. Wherever there are found the principles of civil and religious liberty, an enlightened public sentiment, an efficient regard for the education and morals of the rising generation, wise legislation, public faith, official integrity, domestic virtue; and all the charities that sweeten life, yea, the purest moral sentiment and the exactest administration of justice, and the most respect for law and order, and the strongest expression against all ignorance and superstition, and error, and oppression, and indolence, and irreligion, and vice, there is essential Calvinism, because there is a free and open Bible, and a deference to its authority, and an appreciation of its value—there is faith in God, the practical acknowledgment of his supremacy, the fear of his displeasure, the hope of his favor through Jesus Christ—there is the wide-spread and deep-rooted conviction that right views of Christian doctrine are no less essential to man's temporal than eternal welfare; that neither in the church nor in the state can man be blest unless God is glorified.

In Dr. Henry's work Calvin appears, as it were, the personification of Christian faith in all its genuine strength; contending, on the one hand, against the errors of Romanism, and on the other against the abuses of Protestantism; but

ever maintaining his scriptural ground without the shadow of wavering, a quivering of fear, or a feeling of despondency; and preserving, amid all the conflicting elements of the times, the just medium between Papal tyranny and Protestant anarchy: thus confuting the pretext that there is no alternative for the mind in quest of peace but either to rest in the negations of rationalism, or blindly succumb to ghostly rule; and thus, also, when viewed apart from the incidental appendages of his system, furnishing us with a safe guide amid the errors and delusions of the present, and leading us, by his own example, to the only theology that is worthy of the name, and the only religion worth possessing—the theology of the Scriptures historically viewed and critically expounded—the religion of the Bible.

We cannot but think, therefore, that the cordial thanks of all who value biblical theology, are due to Dr. Henry; and aside from the important fact that his work will tend to disabuse the general mind of false impressions in respect to Calvin's private life, we regard it as of especial value on account of the copiousness of its extracts from Calvin's various writings, which give the reader a full view of his opinions on a wide circle of subjects of great practical importance. It shows that "the principle of Protestantism does not consist in a free, lawless inquiry of the understanding, which necessarily leads to anarchy and ruin, but in a devout employment of the mind and conscience, as enlightened and governed by the Holy Spirit;" Calvin's main position having been, that the church does not determine the authority of Scripture, the church being itself founded on Scripture; but that the Spirit works in the hearts of all who devoutly address themselves to its teachings, and gives witness to the truth. He was opposed to all laws which tend to ensnare the conscience, since Christ is our only law-giver; but though the tyranny of the Pope should be resisted, the yoke of Christ, he maintained, must be borne. Some might think their freedom invaded when the church, to guard her communion, inquired into their scriptural belief; but there was no infringement on the rights of conscience, when nothing was demanded but what Christ himself had taught and required. Absolute, unconditional freedom does not exist within the pale of Christ's church. That freedom

which is there enjoyed is defined by the Scriptures, and secured by the Spirit. The true Christian bows his will most freely to the authority of the word, and by consequence to that system of doctrine which is taught in the Scriptures according to the judgment of the church in her synodical capacity. They who substitute their own preconceptions or conclusions for the great facts and principles of God's written word in violation of its fair, obvious import, and of the analogy of faith, and who consequently refuse to submit themselves in faith to the guidance of the Holy Ghost, belong not to the church but to the world. All heresies and schisms, in Calvin's judgment, arose from men's wilful neglect to look to the *ground of truth*, or to *seek the head*, the doctrine of the heavenly Master. He deeply lamented all appearance of schism, was actuated by a sincere desire to unite all the members of the evangelical churches in one body, showed by what bond it might have been effected—the bond of evangelical truth and spiritual affection—strove for unity in his contest with error, and as far as practicable promoted it, as our author says, by the settlement of the controversy on the Lord's Supper, through the formularies and conventions which deserve so much respect, and especially by means of synodical intercourse. To insinuate, therefore, that his only object was unity of faith in his doctrine of predestination is as false as it is malicious. This man—who, his enemies would have us believe, was ready at all hazards to quarrel about predestination—in the name of the church gave his hand to HERMANN, who asked that his difficulties on this very point might not be made a hindrance to the admission of himself and his children into church communion. This is the man, too, who said, "What, dear Bullinger, should more anxiously occupy us in our letters than the endeavor to keep up brotherly friendship among us by all possible means? We see how important it is not only for us, but for the whole Christian church, that all those should keep together in the profession of truth, to whom the Lord has committed the ability to be useful in his church. . . . I am ready to be surety for Bucer, and to pledge myself that no reason exists for your suspecting him. He is endowed, it is true, with remarkable penetration and acuteness of judgment, yet is there no one who labors so much as he to keep

himself in the simplicity of the word of God." . . . "Fain would I," he said to à-Lasco, "that all the churches of Christ were so united that the angels might look down from heaven and add to our glory with their harmony!"

But it is time that we refer our readers for more explicit information to Dr. Henry's "Life and Times." Whatever imperfections may be detected in the execution of his work, it conveys to us this one grand impression, that Calvin was not such a man as he has often been invidiously portrayed; and that his system, despite of its minor defects is eminently worthy of profound study; that while Calvinism, in its perverted forms, must lead, as it has in many instances, to innumerable evils, in both church and state, Calvinism proper opposes nothing but what is tyrannical, false, selfish, and impure; favors all that is true, and just, and lovely, and of good report—leads to all that is for man's highest good and God's glory!

Let us not be misunderstood, as though we would substitute any human system in the place of God's Word, or ascribe to man's intellect what is due only to the teachings and influences of God's Spirit. When we use a term which has been so invidiously employed, we speak not of any opinions which Calvin, as an individual, may have held, but only of those truths which his system of doctrine embodies—truths peculiar neither to him nor to Knox—which originated neither with him nor with Augustine, which date back further than the period of creed-making for the reformed churches, still further than the church authorities of any preceding century—yea, even so far back as the councils of eternity. And, with that book before us, which Calvin so deeply revered and prayerfully studied—whence, too, he derived all that is true, and only what is true, in his own system of belief, we say to the men, and especially to the youth of our times, exposed as they are, on the one hand, to Pantheism, and on the other to Romanism: There is a **RELIGION** which recognises no baseless speculations, no false assumptions; admits of no "polytheistic admixtures," nor semi-sensual auxiliaries; has no alliance with either a mystic philosophy or a sensuous ritualism; and neither courts the smile nor dreads the frown of the world: there is a **FAITH** which stands not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of

God: there is, too, a cloud of witnesses now, as there has been in every age of the church—witnesses chosen of God, and proclaiming now as ever, and with one and the same voice, “the glorious gospel of the grace of God!” Next in conspicuity to him who, with his dying breath, exclaimed, “I have fought the fight,”—“I have kept the faith,”—“I know in whom I have believed,”—“I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against the last day,”—comes *Luther*, who attested its sublime superiority to all earth-born motives, all sublunary interests, when under circumstances more tempting and more trying than ever man was before placed in, he laid his hand on that book, and solemnly affirmed, “*I cannot retract; so help me God!*” And after him, whom shall we name but John Calvin, who, from the first moment that he apprehended truth, exemplified the self-evidencing power of faith, despite of the suggestions of “the carnal mind,” in opposition to all the assaults of infidelity and error, and amid the scoffs and jeers of a godless world. Yes: “*See there that iron man, who never knew throughout his life what doubt was, and who subjected himself like a child to the authority of the Holy Scriptures.*”

ART. II.—ON THE RELATION BETWEEN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, AND SOME PARTS OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCE. By John Pye Smith, D.D., F.G.S., Divinity Tutor in the Protestant Dissenting College at Homerton. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1840.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE Congregationalists of Great Britain some twenty years ago established in London a Library for the use of their denomination; and made provision for the delivery annually of a series of Lectures on some religious subject which might be thought by those charged with the selection of the Lecturer at the time of special interest. This volume consists of the series delivered in 1837–38, we believe, and published in 1839. A controversy had for several years

been carried on in Great Britain respecting the theory entertained generally by geologists of the age of the earth:—one class of writers urging against it as a fatal objection that it contradicts the account given in Genesis of the origin of the globe; and the other attempting to vindicate it from that charge. A high interest being excited by the discussion, and a wish felt by many for further information on the subject, Dr. Smith—who was a member of the Geological Association, and was known to concur in the views maintained by that body respecting the history of the world—was solicited to deliver this course of lectures, in which it is his object to prove that the earth was called into existence at a date immeasurably earlier than the six days of Genesis, and to show that that view is consistent with the statements made in the Scriptures respecting the period of its creation. In order to that, he first states what he deems the great facts of geology, and regards as demonstrating that a vast round of ages must have been occupied in the formation of the strata. He next gives his judgment of the objections that have been alleged against that view. And finally, he presents the principle on which he supposes the narrative of the creation in Genesis is susceptible of an interpretation that brings it into harmony with his theory. The lectures are written with a good deal of pretension to scientific knowledge; they wear a learned and imposing air; and they have met a very wide acceptance, and are regarded, we believe, in this country, as on the whole one of the ablest defences that has appeared of the geological theory.

Do they then present a satisfactory view of the subject? Had Dr. Smith a just understanding of the theory he attempts to vindicate? Was he aware of the objections to which it is obnoxious? And does the expedient by which he endeavors to bring the sacred word into consistency with it, meet the exigency, and accomplish their reconciliation? We think not. We apprehend that he had but a superficial acquaintance with the subject; that, dazzled with the novelty and brilliance of the discoveries that had been made in the strata, he adopted—as was his habit on other themes—the views respecting them, advanced by writers of distinction, without a careful examination of their import; that he was altogether unaware of the contradictions the theory offers to

the laws of matter, and saw but very inadequately its inconsistency with the sacred narrative ; and that the expedient by which he flattered himself he brought the Bible into harmony with his system, so far from being adequate to that end, had no adaptation to it whatever ; but that instead, the principle on which he proceeds confutes his own, and establishes the opposite conclusion. A brief exposition of his views will render this apparent.

The theory he advances in respect to the origin of the world is : 1. That the creation announced Gen. i. 1, was the creation of the whole material universe ; and that that creation took place unknown and innumerable ages anterior to the date of the six days' work which is recorded in the remainder of that chapter :—

“ In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. This sublime sentence stands at the head of the sacred volume, announcing that there was an epoch, a point in the flow of infinite duration, when *the whole of the dependent universe*, or whatever portion of it first had existence, was *brought* into being ; and that this commencement of being was not from pre-existent materials, nor by fortune, chance, or accident, nor through the skill of any finite agent, but absolutely and solely by the will, wisdom, and power of the ONE and ONLY GOD. It was a *creation* in the proper sense, not a modelling, or new-forming. The phrase ‘in the beginning’ is used several times in Scripture to denote the commencement of whatever flow of time or series of things, the subject spoken of requires. But here the expression specifies an *action* or *taking place at this point of time* ; an act of the Infinite Being. But *When* that beginning was, when that act was put forth, it was not the design of revelation to inform us.”—Pp. 227, 228.

2. He holds that the universe was created in the condition, represented by the nebular theory, of gas, or fusion, or in such a state that its elements immediately assumed those forms :—

“ What was the condition or constitution of the first created matter ! Certainly it falls within the province of general physics to examine this question ; and if the investigation be conducted in the true spirit of genuine religion—though it may not be demonstratively answered in the present life, yet valuable approximations may be made to it. *The nebular hypothesis*, ridiculed as it has

been by persons whose ignorance cannot excuse their presumption. is regarded as in a *very high degree probable* by some of the finest and most Christian minds. If I may venture to utter my own impressions, I must profess it as the most reasonable supposition, *and the correlate of the nebular theory*, that God originally gave being to the primordial elements of things, the very small number of simple bodies, endowing each with its own wondrous properties—then that the action of those properties, in the ways which his wisdom ordained, and which we call laws, produced and is still producing, all the forms and changes of organic and inorganic natures; and that the series is by him destined to proceed in combinations and multiplications ever new, without limit of space or end of duration, to the unutterable joy of all holy creatures, and to the eternal display of his glory who fixed the wondrous frame.”—Pp. 229, 230.

.8. Like others, accordingly, who adopt that hypothesis, he holds that the interior of the earth is still in a state of fusion, and regards that fiery mass as the agent to which volcanoes owe their existence, and mountains and continents their elevation above the sea.

“There are good grounds for supposing that beyond a certain thickness for the solid crust of the earth, which can hardly be estimated at so much as thirty miles, the next contiguous matter is in a state of fusion, at a temperature probably higher than any that man can produce by artificial means, or any natural heat that can exist on the surface. Whether, in like manner, the whole interior of our planet be composed of melted matter, or whether there be a solid nucleus, and whether such nucleus be close-grained, or more probably cavernous, the solid partitions being infusible, and the disseminated vesicles filled with gaseous substances at a very high temperature, thus presenting an analogy to the appearance of ordinary boiling liquids, are parts of the problem upon which eminent geologists are not agreed. But in this they are agreed, that they will not put conjecture, however probable, in the rank which is due only to decisive evidence; and that they will wait with patience till such evidence shall be attained. In the meantime, the highest efforts of mathematical genius are on the stretch for the resolution of the problem. But that a large part of the interior matter of the earth, and that part in contact with the solid crust on which we dwell, is in the state of fusion by heat appears to be a doctrine established by most satisfactory proofs.”—Pp. 48, 49.

“Let but the deposits at the bottom of the sea, over any particular

area, proceed to a certain amount of thickness, and upheaving must take place; escape of the fiery liquid below by a volcanic vent may not be permitted; new continents must then be raised from the bed of the sea, and now existing land must resume its former place at the bottom of the waters. It may be said that this is a slower process than numbers can assign. Be it so; but before this point is reached, the operation of the same constant cause may produce earthquakes and volcanic explosions under the soil of Great Britain or Germany, or the intermediate sea; and, in a few moments, may send into eternity every human creature over a wide district. That these countries have not been the seat of such destructive outbursts within the records of history, or since the creation of man, forms no objection. That they have been so agitated in former periods is among the most certain of facts; and no man can be assured that the renewal of similar events will not take place at any hour."—P. 27.

4. He holds that betwixt the act recorded Genesis i. 1, and the creative acts detailed in the subsequent verses of the chapter, a vast and immeasurable period intervened, during which the earth existed in much the state in which it now is, having continents, islands, seas, and rivers, and being the theatre of animal and vegetable life; and that it was during that period that the strata that constitute the present crust of the earth were formed.

"The evidence of geological phenomena constrains us to the belief that our earth has existed, has been the seat of life, and has undergone many changes of its surface through periods of time utterly beyond human power to assign. That evidence is of distinct and independent kinds, chiefly derived from the appearance of stratification, and the remains of animal and vegetable life; and to at least most of those who have taken pains to become competently acquainted with its nature and variety, it produces the effect of an overpowering ocular and tangible demonstration. At the same time, there is extreme difficulty in communicating such a knowledge of the facts to persons who have not the sensible perceptions upon which it rests. I have, therefore, felt it to be necessary, in the preceding lectures, to rest my repeated assertions, in reference to this subject, upon authority, pleading that the authority is of a kind sufficient to be the ground of certainty, on account of the moral and intellectual character of the witnesses, their scientific qualifications, their opportunities for investigation upon the largest scale, their original pre-

possession against this conclusion, and, finally, their number and diversity as to country, party, religious denomination, and other circumstances that are rational guarantees against prejudice.

"We readily acknowledge that the problem to represent geological by astronomical time, is of the greatest difficulty; perhaps it is utterly beyond human power to resolve in the present state of our being. Some approximation is all that we can venture to hope for. It is self-evident that the application of any continuous measure of time analogous to our common periods of multiples and products, is utterly out of question. It would be the height of absurdity to imagine it, for each one of the phenomena whose aggregate forms the whole case, must have occupied its own particular portion of time, destitute of any rule of conformity to others. In the formation of strata, each process (transportation, deposition, consolidation, elevation, and subsidence; to be followed by a renewal of similar actions under new conditions, and that probably several times repeated) might occupy a duration different from that of the corresponding process in any other stratum or system of strata. Yet, this does not set aside the reality of a prevailing analogy, nor does it destroy the evidence of a general conclusion from a multitude of particular facts, *each one of which must have required for its consummation a very long period*; we may, in most cases, say *immensely long*."—Pp. 317, 318.

5. He holds that the continents and islands of that period were wholly different from those that now subsist, and that it was from their detritus, borne down by streams to the sea, that the strata of which the crust of the earth consists were formed.

"The rocks which lie above them (the crystallized) are all composed of earthy matter, that is, different mixtures of sand, clay, lime, with minor proportions of some other interspersed minerals. *These have been washed away from the previously elevated rocks* by the action, first, of the atmosphere and variation of temperature, disintegrating and loosening the surfaces; and then of dropping rain and running rills and streams, washing off the materials in fine particles or coarser grain, through all degrees of attenuation, carrying them down into lower situations, and finally, after perhaps a very long succession of these transporting and sedimentary processes, depositing them on levels of rest, in the quiet bottoms or local depressions of lakes and seas. Each sediment or deposit is called a layer or bed, for convenience using the Latin word *stratum*."—P. 50.

"Every stratum is itself a proof that dry land existed contemporaneously above the level of the waters, *for the mineral materials composing strata are the wearings and washings down, coarse and fine, from the surface of the exposed land.* Thus were produced areas, formed by each kind of the matter brought down, and having their peculiar characters and boundaries."—P. 65.

6. He supposes that that ancient earth, or that part of it to which the narrative in Gen. i. with the exception of the first verse relates, was reduced to a state of ruin anterior to the six days' work that is recorded in that part of the chapter; and that the acts of the six days, instead of being creative, were, so far as the earth itself is concerned, employed in merely restoring it, or rather a portion of it, from a temporary ruin, to a habitable state:—

"I must profess then my conviction, that we are not obliged by the terms made use of, to extend the narrative of the six days to a wider application than this:—*a description, in expressions adapted to the ideas and capacities of mankind in the earliest ages, of a series of operations, by which the Being of omnipotent wisdom and goodness ADJUSTED AND FURNISHED the earth generally; but as the particular object under consideration here, a PORTION of its surface for most glorious purposes, in which a newly-formed creature should be the object of those manifestations of the authority and grace of the Most High, which shall to eternity show forth his perfections above all other methods of their display.** This region was first, by atmospheric and geological causes of previous operation under the will of the Almighty, brought into a condition of superficial ruin, or some kind of general disorder. *With reverence* I propose the supposition that this state was produced by the subsidence of the

* We ask the reader's attention to the style of this passage. Instead of expressing himself with simplicity, in what a cloud of verbiage he endeavors to wrap the odious features of his proposition! With what an affectation of awe and admiration of the perfections and purposes of God he attempts to gild the bold contradictions it presents to the teachings of his word! This is characteristic of the philosophic infidelity of the age. Numberless examples might be pointed out in the writings of the speculatists who deify nature, and especially in the forms of material and ideal pantheism. Like Satan, in order more effectually to elude suspicion and conciliate confidence, they shroud their infidelity in the livery of religion. This may not have been wholly an artifice in Dr. Smith, but rather an attempt to ape that class of philosophers with whom he was extremely ambitious of enjoying a rank: it is unfortunately, however, a very conspicuous feature of his work.

region, of which the immediate cause might be the same that we know has often operated to work a similar effect in various districts upon the earth's surface; namely, that which is the probable cause of earthquakes—a *vast movement of the igneous mass below*."—Pp. 282, 283.

Such are the great features of his theory of the origin and history of the earth. That it not only is not demonstrated by him, however, but that he was not even aware of its real import, or the grounds on which it rests, is easily made apparent.

The first point to which we ask attention is the utter absence of appropriate proofs of his several propositions. Let the reader scan the passages in which they are advanced, and he will find that they rest on nothing but assumption; not a semblance of evidence is alleged that clearly demonstrates the truth of any one of them. Such is indisputably the fact with that part of the first having any bearing on the question at issue, in which he asserts that there is no indication in the history of the creation in Genesis i. when the act recorded in the first verse was exerted. In that statement he *assumes*, without argument, what his hypothesis required him to prove, that a period of unknown and immeasurable length intervened between the act narrated in the first verse, and the creation of light recorded in the third. If he had any proof that such a space intervened there, why did he not produce it? Not a particle, however, does he offer. He takes for granted precisely what his theory requires, and what he affects to demonstrate by satisfactory evidence! What an admirable method of bringing the word of God into harmony with the dicta of his dreamy and preposterous philosophy!

Such is the fact also with his second proposition, in which he gives his assent to the theory that the earth first existed in a gaseous form; and with his third also, in which he maintains that it afterwards passed into a state of fusion. He does not even affect to regard either of those notions as demonstrated, but advances them as mere hypotheses that have only in his judgment a high probability.

There is as entire an omission of evidence likewise of his fourth position, which is the only one that has even a pretence of any proof. For he offers nothing to sustain it,

except the mere fact that he and others regard the strata as presenting ample demonstration that the earth has existed and been the seat of life through an immeasurable round of ages. How the strata effect that demonstration he does not show ;—so far from it, he offers it as an apology for his not alleging anything to support it but his own and the opinion of others, that it was impossible for him to state the evidence in such a manner, as to carry his hearers to the conviction which he wished them to feel of its truth ! An extraordinary pretext, truly, to justify in such a discussion the substitution of mere authority for evidence ! If he had such a superfluity and grandeur of proofs as he affects, that he was perplexed by their multitude, complexity, and greatness, could he not have selected at least one or two so clear and decisive, as to constrain his hearers and readers to see and feel the certainty of his proposition ? Instead of alleging, however, or being able to allege any such proofs, he did not even know, as we shall soon make apparent, what the real ground was on which his own belief of it rested.

His fifth and sixth propositions he does not attempt to support by any proofs. They are mere assumptions, of which he could not by any possibility have possessed a particle of evidence. Instead of an assemblage of demonstrated facts, his system is thus throughout a mere hypothesis without a shadow of proof to support it. It has nothing whatever for its basis except his mere dictum, or the conjectures, assumptions, and opinions of the geologists whom he takes as his guides. Yet notwithstanding this utter destitution of everything like evidence, he passes it off with all the pomp and parade of an unquestionable truth, sustained by such a mass of proofs, that none but the most prejudiced and unscientific can withhold their assent from it, and unfolding such a world of novel and sublime realities, as to reflect a dazzling splendor on the fortunate philosophers who have invented and discovered them. And it is to save religion from the destruction with which he acknowledges it is threatened by this preposterous system, that he attempts to bring the word of God into harmony with it by interpolations, conjectures, and constructions, that are not only without authority, but that utterly misrepresent and contradict its most indisputable teachings.

In the next place, he proceeds throughout his discussion under the impression that his theory is based on the great facts of the science; such as that the formation of the crust of the earth took place since the creation of the globe itself; that the strata of which it mainly consists have been deposited from water, and are very numerous and of great thickness, and that they imbed a vast multitude of vegetables and animals; and he probably had not a suspicion that these are not the real grounds on which his theory is built. No mistake, however, could be greater, or indicate a more extraordinary inadvertence and misconception. A moment's consideration should have shown him that neither the mere number and mass of the strata, their deposition from water, nor the multitude of the vegetable and animal relics that are buried in them, forms any criteria of the period which was occupied in their formation. That must have depended on the sources from which their materials were derived, the nature of the agents by which they were conveyed to the places of their deposit, and the scale on which those agents acted. If the materials were drawn from sources that yielded an inexhaustible supply, if they were in a condition that rendered them easily transportable to the ocean in vast masses by the agents to which they were subjected, and if those agents acted at numerous points and with great energy, the strata undoubtedly might have been formed in a few centuries, as well as in an immeasurable round of ages. It is, accordingly, not on the strata themselves, but on an hypothesis respecting the quarter from which the earthy portions of them were derived, the substances from which they were produced, and the agents by which they were transported to the places of their deposition, that his belief of the vast age of the earth is founded; an hypothesis that exhibits the processes by which those materials were reduced to a state that admitted of their removal to the ocean, and the agents by which they were transferred to its waters, as such that the construction of the strata must have proceeded at so slow a pace that an incalculable series of ages must have been required for their completion. For he holds that those materials were drawn from pre-existing continents and islands, of solid rocks; that those rocks were disintegrated and reduced to sand and dust by the action of the atmo-

sphere, water, heat, frost, and other similar agents; and that their detritus was transported by streams to the ocean, and spread by tides and currents over its bottom, which would undoubtedly make an incalculable succession of ages necessary to the completion of the work. Thus, he says :—

“ Every stratum consists of a mass of earthy matters, which *once formed the substance of rocks on elevated land*, partially with the exception of limestone. . . . Those portions of the rocks have been separated from their parent masses, worn down, comminuted, transported often to great distances by the force of water, deposited, consolidated, elevated, and hardened. Operations of this kind have been repeated many times, homogeneously and heterogeneously, as to the mineralogical constitution of the masses; but the thickness, the lamination, the joints and cleavage, and the imbedded remains of animal and vegetable beings, cannot be contemplated with due attention without producing a conviction *stronger than words can express*, of periods of time amazing and overwhelming to the mind.” —P. 321.

“ Now, we want a measure for the rate of deposition. A *perfect* rule for this is beyond the present reach of science; but there is an ample sufficiency of *ascertained facts*, to prove that *the ‘whole series of deposits has occupied untold ages.’* . . . I can only hint at the phenomena which furnish the grounds for this approximative estimate. They are *observations upon the rates of deposit*, in all kinds and in all circumstances, *as it is continually going on in ponds, lakes, river-beds, estuaries, deltas, flat shores, silicious and limestone springs of water*, and conclusions analogical, but most powerfully supported, concerning the deposits in the depths of the ocean.”—P. 297.

Nothing can be clearer, then, than that he founds his inference of the age of the earth, not on the strata themselves, but on a mere hypothesis respecting the mode of their formation, in which he refers their materials to continents and islands of rock, that were slowly disintegrated and borne to the sea; and he takes the rate at which deposits are now made in ponds, lakes, and estuaries, as the measure of the rapidity with which the work was then accomplished. Instead of the strata themselves, therefore, it is on a merely supposititious world that his inference is founded, and on the gratuitous assumption that the agents that were concerned in the production of the strata, acted on the same scale in that world as they are now acting in this. Take away these

hypotheses, of neither of which has he a particle of proof, and his belief of the age of the world is left without the semblance of a foundation. What a fine exemplification it presents of his penetration, that this palpable fact wholly escaped his notice! Not a glimpse appears to have been caught by him of this aspect of his theory; not a suspicion seems to have flashed on him that, to verify his reasoning, he must first prove the existence of those supposititious continents of granite, and by evidence wholly independent of the present strata; for if he cannot prove their reality by evidences from other sources, if he can only contemplate them in his argument as having a hypothetical existence, how can the conclusion he founds on them have more than a hypothetical authority? To treat an inference from such a mere ideal existence as founded on a physical reality that is ascertained by the senses, is to confound fancy with fact, and convert his whole speculation into a childish and preposterous farce. But he could not prove the existence of those imagined continents, nor render their existence in any measure probable, either from independent evidence or from the present strata. The attempt would have involved him in inextricable difficulties, and shown his theory, instead of harmonizing with the history of the creation in Genesis, to be hopelessly irreconcilable to it. How could he demonstrate their existence irrespective of the present strata, which he supposes to have been drawn from them? If there is no evidence in the present crust of the globe that they once had a being, there surely is none anywhere else within the circle of our knowledge that they ever existed. How could he infer their existence from the present continents, unless it were on the assumption that one set of continents cannot be formed except their materials are derived from a pre-existing set? If there is no such infallible connexion between the formation of one set, and the pre-existence of another, then the existence of the present is no absolute proof of the antecedence of those whose pre-existence he assumes. But if there is such a necessary connexion between the existence of one set of continents, and the precedence of another set from which their materials are derived, then that set which immediately preceded the present must have been preceded by a still earlier set, and that also by

another, and so on, in an eternal series; which would imply that the matter of the earth was itself eternal, and thence self-existent; and, therefore, that no such creative fiat as is announced in Genesis i. 1, by which the heavens and earth were called into being, was ever exerted;—which is to overthrow, instead of sustaining, his construction of that passage. What a charming issue of the principles on which he proceeds! What a splendid verification of the lofty eulogies he bestows on the demonstrative character of his theory!

Nor on the supposition that his fabled continents existed, could he any more prove that the rate at which earthy matter was transported from them to the sea and wrought into strata, would have been the same as that at which deposits are now formed in ponds, lakes, and the ocean, by matter borne to them by streams and rivers. So far from it, it is not only clear that it must have been immeasurably slower, inasmuch as no masses of loose soil and fine sand like those which cover the surface of our lands could have existed on such continents, ready without further comminution to be borne to the sea whenever subjected to the action of powerful torrents and rapid streams; but it is demonstrably certain that such granitic masses could never in any period whatever have been disintegrated by the action of the atmosphere, moisture, and other similar agents, so as to be susceptible of transportation to the ocean. A large share of the crystallized rocks that rise from our present continents into the atmosphere, have undergone no sensible disintegration since they reached their present degree of hardness. Nor is there the slightest reason to believe that they will in any future period, no matter how long it may be, while they are only acted on by such agents as those to which they are now subjected. If, then, as he assumes, the strata could not have been formed unless the materials were drawn from such crystallized continents, it is not only clear that a period of immeasurable length would have been requisite for their formation; but it is demonstrably certain that they could never have been formed at all. The argument by which he would prove his point, would thus defeat itself. Grant him what he assumes respecting the mode in which the strata were constructed, and it follows irresistibly that their construction could never have taken place. What a creditable posi-

tion for one who talks so loftily of the merits of his hypotheses, and boasts that the facts by which they are evinced are so numberless and decisive that "they cannot be contemplated with due attention without producing a conviction stronger than words can express," that "periods of time amazing and overwhelming to the mind" must have passed during the formation of the earth's present stratified crust! It is clear, then, not merely that he has not proved his theory of the age of the world, but that he had not the faintest conception of the ground on which it rests, and the infinite contradictions and absurdities with which it is embarrassed.

In the third place, it is equally clear that he was unaware that the hypothesis on which he proceeds, that the interior of the earth is now a molten ocean, and that its whole mass was, anterior to the formation of the crust of the globe, in a state of fusion, is altogether inconsistent with the facts of geology and with the laws of matter; and that if admitted, in place of yielding any support to his theory, would hopelessly confute it.

It is plain that if the whole matter of the globe had existed in a state of absolute fusion from heat, no portion of it could have been capable of any further spontaneous action by which a greater measure of heat could have been evolved. The power of every particle to give out or elicit from its neighbor a further degree of caloric would have been exhausted, and the whole tendency of the mass would have thereafter been to decline in temperature by radiation from the surface, and to shrink in its dimensions and pass into a solid form; precisely as in the union of ordinary chemical agents, such for example as unslacked lime and water, when the whole of the lime has undergone the action of the water, and given out all the heat and generated all the gas which that process can produce, their mutual action by which caloric is developed terminates, and no possibility remains of their afterwards rising by their influence on each other to a higher temperature. Instead, the lime immediately begins to give out its extra warmth to the cooler matter by which it is surrounded, and soon sinks to a level with it in temperature and in density. It is clear, then, that if the earth had been in the molten condition which Dr. Smith supposes, no elements could have remained within it capable of a further

chemical agency on each other that would have produced a further development of heat, and consequently that no expansive force could ever have been generated in it by which mountains and continents could have been elevated from the surface, or any portion of the matter thrown up to the exterior by volcanoes. The hypothesis completely excludes the possibility of the origination within the molten deep of any forces whatever for the production of these effects; and thence, instead of answering the ends of his theory, totally defeats it, by showing that no such granite continents could possibly have been formed as those from which he regards the materials of the present strata as having been drawn.

It is demonstrable, moreover, from the laws that govern bodies in their transition from a state of fusion to a low temperature, that solidification, instead of beginning at the surface of such a molten world, would have commenced in the interior. For as matter, in the process of solidification by the radiation of its heat, loses something of its bulk while it gains proportionally in its density, every particle and mass of the surface, as it assumed a crystallized form, would have become relatively so much heavier than an equal bulk of the molten mass in which it was imbedded, that it would instantly have sunk into the deep, and its place at the surface been occupied by a portion of the mass that remained fluid; and the process would have gone on and the whole of the interior lost its heat and assumed a solid form, before a general crystallization could have taken place at the surface; just as if water shrank in its dimensions and attained a greater density in the process of congelation, the frozen particles, instead of floating on the surface, would sink: ice would form at the bottom of streams, lakes, and the polar seas, in place of the top, and advancing as it accumulated towards the surface, the last water frozen would be that which was last in contact with the atmosphere. His theory thus again confutes itself. No solid crust, like that which he supposes, could ever have been formed over such a molten world, leaving the interior, at the depth of a few miles, in a state of complete fusion; while it is equally certain also that no elements could exist in a globe that was solidified in that manner which could afterwards naturally and spontaneously act on each other so as to disengage new volumes of heat, reproduce fusion, and

generate expansive forces that would raise vast tracts of the surface above the general level into mountains and continents; or drive up to the surface vast columns of melted matter through volcanic channels. The supposition that such agents could exist and such processes take place in a world that was crystallized throughout from a state of fusion, is as absurd as it were to suppose that elements exist in ordinary granite, quartz rock, green-stone, hornblende, or trap, that may, without any foreign impulse, spontaneously act on each other in such a manner as to excite ignition and raise them again to fusion. As it is certain from their nature that these rocks can neither be melted nor the elements of which they consist be made to act chemically on each other so as to give out their latent heat, except it be by the action on them of foreign bodies and the communication of caloric from without; so it is equally certain that if the globe consisted wholly of such rocks, no chemical action could arise in it that could generate high measures of heat and reduce vast masses of it to fusion, unless it were caused altogether by extraneous bodies and the communication of caloric from without.

It is clear, moreover, that had the earth been solidified from a state of fusion, and by the mere radiation of its heat, no such rocks as those which now constitute its surface could ever have been formed; nor any of the metals have intermixed with them, or with any other that might have then occupied their place. Had the earth existed in a state of fusion, the several metallic and earthy elements of which it consists would necessarily have assumed a position relatively to each other, in accordance with their several weights, or the force with which they are acted on by the gravitating power; and as they differ in that respect very greatly, those which are the heaviest, such as gold, silver, iron, copper, and others, would have descended to the centre, and those which are lighter, such as lime, alumine, sodium, and others, would have risen towards the surface. Again, as the points at which the different metals and earths fuse, differ very greatly, it is apparent that those which require the greatest degree of heat to melt them, would crystallize or assume a solid form earlier, as radiation took place, than others; and thence, if they were of greater density and weight than those that still con-

tinued fused, they would sink till they reached their place in the scale of weight. It would result, therefore, not only that no metals would have been lodged in the surface, or anywhere within the reach of man; but that no rocks like granite could have been formed, that consist of elements that differ materially both in weight and in the degree of heat that is requisite to their fusion. As the siliceous part of that rock is of greater weight than any of its other elements, and crystallizes at a higher temperature, and as it would thus have been crystallized while the mica and felspar continued in fusion, it would infallibly have sunk from their presence into the depths beneath, and no such combination as the rock presents, in which quartz, mica, and felspar are intermixed in much the same proportions through immense masses, could have taken place.

In whatever relation, then, we look at the hypothesis, and we might add many similar proofs of its error, it is thus seen to be at war with the facts of geology and the laws of matter, and to confute instead of supporting his theory.

Of this, however, Dr. Smith had not the slightest suspicion. Notwithstanding the parade he makes of his knowledge, the self-complacency with which he descants on the necessity of a scientific acquaintance with the subject, and the tone of authority with which he rebukes the ignorance and presumption of the writers who venture to reject his theory, he was in fact totally ignorant of the principles on which his hypotheses and assumptions rest. He never cast a glance; he never dreamed of an investigation, beneath the superficies of the subject. What admirable perspicacity they display, who discern nothing of this; who think him a thorough master of the theme; who take him as their guide, and regard his voice as of sufficient authority for ever to decide the question!

In the fourth place, he was of course totally unaware also that, on his hypothesis, no such subsidence of a portion of the earth's crust could have taken place, as that which he supposes occasioned the ruin which, he holds, it was the object of the six days' creation to repair:—as if the earth had existed in the molten state he represents, and been crystallized by the mere radiation of its heat, the different substances of which it consists would infallibly have been separated from each other and arranged in separate layers

from the centre to the circumference, according to their respective weights, or the energy with which they were acted on by the gravitating power; and the solidification would have commenced at the centre, and advanced regularly upwards, and kept the portion which remained fluid at the surface till the whole was crystallized. No molten sea or vacant abyss could have been left beneath, into which a portion of the crust could have subsided. As the globe would have been a compact mass, regularly increasing in density from the circumference to the centre, no such depression of a part of the surface, as he imagines, could have taken place, unless produced by an impulse from without, as by a shock from another solid world. But that is against his supposition, as well as against the laws by which the orbs of the system are kept in their respective spheres, and such a collision with the earth rendered impossible.

Nor, on his hypothesis, could any causes have been lodged in the interior of the earth, while its crystallization was in progress, that could subsequently have wrought a disruption of its surface, and thrown it into disorder and ruin. First, because its different elements would in a great measure, owing to their different weight, have been distributed into layers by themselves; and thence no one of those strata could possibly have acted chemically on itself so as to have given out latent heat, and generated gases that could have broken up the masses lying above and thrown them into confusion. No chemical action could be produced in such homogeneous bodies, except by the interfusion of a foreign element. Nor could the generation of such expansive forces have taken place in strata consisting throughout of crystals, in which different substances were united, such as mica and felspar, in which silica and alumine, magnesia, potash, and other substances are ingredients. As the union of those substances in crystallization would result from their chemical affinity for each other, that affinity would necessarily continue them unchanged in that union, as long as no foreign force interfered to overcome it by a new and more powerful attraction to some other body. Nor could the strata consisting of different elements act on each other at the point of contact any more than those of the present crust consisting of different substances,—silica, alumina, lime, iron,—can generate

chemical agencies by their mere conjunction with each other. The possibility of a self-origination of chemical processes that could produce earthquakes and volcanoes, and cause a subsidence, or displacement of the surface, would therefore be absolutely excluded.

But apart from its inconsistency with his hypothesis of the earth's fusion, his supposition is without a particle of proof that it was by a subsidence of the surface that the chaotic state was produced, which he holds it was the business of the six days' creation to repair, is wholly unjustifiable in such a discussion, and converts his pretence of reconciling his theory with the history of the creation in Genesis into a mere farce. As the construction he proceeds to put on that narrative is founded entirely on the gratuitous postulate of such a subsidence, his imagined reconciliation of his theory with that history is no reconciliation whatever on the ground of ascertained facts or known truths, but only on supposititious conditions of the reality of which he had not a particle either of evidence or probability. What grosser imposition was ever passed off upon hearers and readers, than the pretext that such a mere supposition or assumption of an event, of the occurrence of which not a hint exists in the Word of God, nor a trace in the discoveries of geology, can bring his theory, which is otherwise in the most palpable antagonism with the Scriptures, into harmony with their teachings, and on the basis of ascertained facts! A conciliation of the theory with the narrative, by a mere supposititious event, is surely no conciliation on the ground of a real one. The harmony that is produced is only supposititious, and leaves the reality and irremediableness of their antagonism precisely where it was before. Yet, that is the nature of the consistency which Dr. Smith flattered himself he had established between his theory of the origin and age of the world, and the testimony of God in his word respecting the date and mode of its creation. It rests entirely on a gratuitous postulation of a geological event, a subsidence of a portion of the earth's crust, "lying between the Caucasian ridge, the Caspian Sea, and Tartary on the north, the Persian and Indian seas on the south, and the high mountain ridges which run at considerable distances on the eastern and the western flank"—(p. 233)—of the occurrence of which he

does not affect to offer any proof, and could not, had he attempted it. Take away that mere figment of his fancy, and his construction of the history of the creation loses all its pertinence to his object; as it then exhibits the six days' work as employed in repairing a ruin of the existence of which there is no evidence in the sacred narrative, and that, moreover, puts that narrative in antagonism with his theory of a previously-existing world. This is sufficiently pitiable; but when we add, that by his hypothesis of the earth's fusion, he cuts himself off from even the supposition of such a subsidence, by precluding the existence in the interior of the globe of any molten sea, or vacant abyss, into which the crust of that or any other region could descend; his boasted reconciliation of his theory with the sacred word becomes a mockery so palpable and monstrous as to be deeply discreditable to his intellect. It is neither just nor consistent with a proper regard to the interests of truth, to spare such a piece of arrant quackery. Such a confusion of mere hypothesis with facts, and contradiction and subversion of one supposition by another, would, in any other profession, consign its author to derision and disgrace.

Having thus presented the great elements of his theory, he next states what he regards as fatal objections to the views which others have advanced on this subject. We shall not follow him through this part of his volume, but merely refer to two important points on which he differs from many of the geologists themselves, and indicate the nature of the reasoning by which he endeavors to confute those who regard the history in Genesis as a history of the earth's creation. He rejects the notion which many entertain that the sun did not exist, or at least was not the source of light to the earth, until the fourth of the six days, Gen. i.

"A prevalent, though not universal, interpretation of the archaic narrative, is, that the sun and all the other heavenly bodies were created on the fourth day after the creation of the earth. An obvious objection to this opinion is, that *light* is mentioned in the account of the first day; 'God said, be light, and light was.' But to this the common answer is, that light was created in a different state, and that on the fourth day it was condensed and collected into a centre, for the solar system of planets; that this centre is the sun,

or within the sun; and that in some similar way the luminous property of the fixed stars was produced.

"Those who adopt this hypothesis, either with or without the modification annexed to it, are perhaps not aware that the spherical figure of the earth, its position in the planetary system, its rotation producing the nights and days, which the Mosaic narrative expressly lays down in numerical succession, the existence of water and that of an atmosphere, both definitely mentioned, and the creation of vegetables on the third day, necessarily imply the presence and the operation of the sun, *unless we resort to some gratuitous supposition of multiplied miracles of the most astounding magnitude.* Those who can satisfy themselves with such supposition, *made without evidence at their own good pleasure, are beyond our reach of reasoning.* No difficulty, no improbability, no natural impossibility appals them. They seem to have the attribute of omnipotence at their command, to help out any hypothesis, or answer any exigency. But I must confess that such modes of resolving difficulties do not approve themselves to my convictions."—Pp. 78, 79.

He thus discards the fancy entertained by so many, that the light of the first three days was merely phosphorescent, or developed from the matter of the earth, in which it had been absorbed. But why did he not, in the structure of his own theory, adhere to the objections he here so justly urges against the gratuitous supposition of events that could never, on the ground on which he proceeds, have come into existence, unless it were by miraculous interpositions of the most astounding nature? No such fusion of the globe as he imagines could ever have been produced by the operation of natural causes; no such granite continents as he supposes to have preceded the present lands, could ever have been formed over such a molten ocean by the powers of nature; no such strata as the present could ever have been formed from detritus derived from such continents; and no portion of the earth's surface, had it been crystallized from such a state of fusion, could ever have sunk down beneath the sea, and formed a ruin like that which he supposes was produced by a subsidence between the Caucasian ridge and the Indian Sea. There is not one of those effects that is not, either absolutely or in the conditions he supposes, incompatible with the laws of matter. Unfortunately, however, in the construction of his own system, he forgets the

just principles on which he here objects to the errors of others.

He rejects the hypothesis that the six days of the creation, instead of days, were long periods of time.

"An hypothesis was resorted to about thirty years ago by several men of eminence in geological knowledge . . . that the six days of creation may be understood of periods of time of indefinite, though of very great, length. Finding, in frequent instances of Scripture use, what is indeed the case in all languages, that the term day is put metaphorically [by synecdoche] to denote any portion of time which has been marked by the accomplishment of some great event or series of events, it was concluded that the same figurative application might be resorted to here. The mind was thus left at liberty to attach to each of these periods any length that the exigency of the case might require, in order to obtain the protracted time which the supporters of this hypothesis knew to be an indispensable provision for the mineral and palæontological formations."—P. 171.

To this "device," which is not only wholly unauthorized and a gross violation of the language, but in place of yielding any aid to those who adopt it, involves them in fresh difficulties, he objects :

"Upon the very face of the document it is manifest that, in the first chapter, the word is used in its ordinary sense. For this primordial record is not a poem nor a piece of oratorical diction, but is a narrative in the simple style that marks the highest majesty. It would be an indication of a deplorable want of taste for the beauty of language, to put a patch of poetical diction upon the face of natural simplicity. But one would think no doubt could remain to one who had before his eyes the concluding formula of each of the six partitions, 'and evening was, and morning was, day one;' and so throughout the series, repeating exactly the same form, only introducing the ordinal numbers, till we arrive at the last, 'and evening was, and morning was, day the sixth.'

"If there were no other reason against this, which I may call device of interpretation, it would appear quite sufficient to require its rejection, that it involves so large an extension in the liberty or license of figurative speech. Poetry speaks very allowably of the day of prosperity or of sorrow, the day of a dynasty or an empire; but the case before us requires a stretch of hyperbole which would be monstrous. A few hundreds, or even thousands, of days turned

into years, would not supply a period sufficiently ample to meet the exigency of geological reasoning; while this way of proceeding to obtain the object desired is sacrificing the propriety and certainty of language, and producing a feeling of revolt in the mind of a plain reader of the Bible."—P. 174.

This construction, on which most now rely who attempt to reconcile the geological theory with the sacred narrative, he thus discards, on the ground that it is unauthorized by the usage of language, and that if admitted, the time which it yields is wholly inadequate to the necessities of the theory.

He lastly notices "the hypothesis which considers the Mosaic record as indubitably affirming the creation of the universe [the heaven and earth] within the period of six natural days, at an epoch about six thousand years back;" and "regards the interval from the creation to the deluge as affording a sufficient lapse of time for the deposition of the chief part of the stratified formations."—P. 175.

In this statement, however, he falls into a very extraordinary mistake. It is not advanced as an *hypothesis* that the Mosaic record indubitably affirms that the creation of the heavens and earth was accomplished in the period of six natural days about six thousand years ago. To advance it as an hypothesis would imply that there is no direct and specific affirmation that that creation took place in the six days. But that is not what the parties to whom he refers maintain. They hold, as he in effect alleges, that the narrative in Genesis "indubitably" teaches that the creation of the heavens and earth was wrought in the six days, and they show that no other construction can be put on the language of the record, except by just such an unwarrantable violation of its laws as that to which he so strenuously objects in respect to the word day. It is the natural grammatical meaning of the passage, which they receive and maintain as the truth.

What now are the objections which he urges against this construction? Are they drawn from the language of the narrative? Are they founded on the laws of philology? Does he convict them of assigning to any of the terms a false meaning; or interpolating any words or any sense that

does not actually belong to the record? Nothing of the kind. There is not a hint that any ground exists for such an objection to their views! The only expedient by which he attempts to invalidate their interpretation of the text, is, first, the representation that they had but a very inadequate knowledge of the facts of geology; that what they had acquired *they drew chiefly from the geological writers themselves*, whose theory they reject; and that their rejection of their theory implies that those writers were *mistaken* either in their facts or their meaning. Thus, he says:

"The first thought that strikes our minds on a survey of the inquiry is, that *the materials* of which the advocates of this theory have framed it, are what they have derived from the labors of the very men who hold the opposite doctrine. The men whose persevering toils have brought to light the great facts of geology, who have traced them through their vast extent, and who have described them with careful precision by their pens and pencils, are represented by this hypothesis as the worst interpreters of those facts, either incapable of drawing logical inferences from their own observations, or unwilling to declare what the honest inferences are. Upon the former supposition, it must appear a strange thing that the persons who have given such distinguished proof of their general ability, and of their acuteness of penetration in this particular department of scientific study; *who possess the resources of those auxiliary sciences* which are the best grounds in physical inquiry, and the most stern checks upon sanguine minds, to guard them against precipitance or inaccuracy in drawing conclusions;—it must appear a strange thing that such persons should labor under an obliquity of judgment so peculiar and so obstinate that they cannot see the just conclusion from premises which they have obtained by so much expense of time and fortune, of mental and bodily toil."—P. 176.

These are certainly very extraordinary grounds of objection. He alleges it first as a disqualification of these writers that they drew much of their information from the volumes of the geologists whose theory they assailed! But what impropriety is there in that? Why should they not avail themselves of the knowledge which those volumes furnish? Does Dr. S. mean to insinuate that the representations made in them of facts, are not reliable? If not; if

their statements are accurate, were they not published for the very purpose of giving information, and with the expectation that they would be accepted as true? Why then may not the facts they present be taken as facts, and made the ground of reasoning as properly by those who reject the false inferences geologists have drawn from them, as by those who receive their inferences as true? Dr. S. must have felt that there was an extreme dearth of legitimate reasons, or he would scarcely have stooped to offer such a preposterous objection.

The other consideration which he urges is of a still more extraordinary character. It is nothing less than that the rejection of the conclusions drawn by geological writers from the facts of the science, implies that they have reasoned falsely, or fallen into great mistakes, in respect to the results to which their discoveries and principles lead; and is a downright denial, therefore, of their infallibility! The annals of hallucination may be searched in vain, we suspect, for an instance of folly that transcends this. On what pretext can the theory of the geologists be rationally rejected, unless on the ground that they are mistaken in the conclusions they have drawn from the strata or in their speculations respecting their origin? If their views of the latter are mistaken, is not that, at least, one of the points where their error lies? And is it not as justifiable to point out an error there, as it is in their descriptions of facts? But on what ground is it that Dr. Smith claims that they should be held to be infallible as reasoners and speculatists, and their dicta received instead of the word of God? Is it, as he intimates, that they "possess the resources of those auxiliary sciences"—chemistry and mechanics—"which are the best guides in physical inquiry"—which, as we have shown, they wholly overlook and contradict in their speculations? Did ever a writer give more unfortunate proofs of extraordinary hallucination? He here lets out, however, the secret of his faith in the geological theory. It was founded entirely on the opinions of the writers, who had risen to repute in the cultivation of the science. Attracted by the novelty and interest of their discoveries, and confounding their speculations with their facts, he embraced the

whole, on their testimony, without any comprehension of the import of their doctrine, or suspicion of the principles on which they are founded.

His other charge against the dissentients from the geological theory is, that they do not carry their investigation of the works of the geologists *far enough*; that they take but partial views of their system, and make it too much their business to point out its incoherences; and finally, that they themselves indulge in speculations that are crude and mistaken. In what way, however, this, supposing it to be so, relieves the geological theory from the charge of contradicting the history of the creation in Genesis, Dr. Smith does not inform us. Nor is it easy to see. If an embarrassing objection to Mr. Penn, Mr. Fairholme, Mr. Kirby, and the other writers to whom he refers, it surely does not alter the relation of the geological theory to the sacred word, nor exempt it from any of its inconsistencies with the laws of matter. Instead of a vindication of the theory, it is only an assault on its opponents. Yet these are the only considerations by which he attempts to set aside their construction of the history of the creation.

Having thus stated his theory of the origin of the earth, and set aside, as he supposes, their views, who regard the history in Genesis, as a history of its creation, he at length presents the principle on which he thinks the sacred text is reconcilable with his theory.

But we must postpone our notice of this part of his volume to our next number.

ART. III.—1. OXFORD UNIVERSITY COMMISSION. Report of her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenue of the University of Oxford, together with the Evidence and an Appendix: presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty. London: Printed by W. Clowes & Sons, Stamford Street, for her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1852.

2. FIVE YEARS IN AN ENGLISH UNIVERSITY. By Charles

Astor Bristed, late Foundation Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. 'Αλλ' ἐπ' ἡδρῶν δῶτα πολλά μαθήματα ἐς σοφίαν.—ARISTOPH. *Aves.* 376. Second edition. New York: Putnam & Co. 1852.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM C. FOWLER,
Late Professor of Rhetoric, Amherst College.

THE Oxford University Commission was composed of the following persons, appointed by the Queen, namely, "the Right Reverend Father in God Samuel, Bishop of Norwich; our trusty and well-beloved Archibald Campbell Tait, Doctor of Civil Law, Dean of Carlisle; Francis Jeune, Clerk, Doctor of Civil Law, Master of Pembroke College in our University of Oxford; Henry George Liddell, Clerk, Master of Arts, Vice Warden of the Stannaries of Cornwall; Baden Powell, Clerk, Master of Arts, Savilian Professor of Geometry in our University of Oxford; and George Henry Sacheverell Johnson, Clerk, Master of Arts of Queen's College in our University of Oxford." Under the royal authority they were directed to inquire into the state, discipline, studies, and revenues of the University, with authority to call for and examine books, papers, documents, and records, and to report in two years from the 31st of August, 1850, which is the date of their Commission. After a great number of meetings they submitted their Report on the 27th of April, 1852, which was published last summer.

From an examination of the Report with the Accompanying Evidence, occupying in the whole more than seven hundred and fifty pages quarto, we have been able to obtain a mass of valuable information never before disclosed to the public, some of which we proceed to lay before our readers.

The *object* of the Commission is set forth in a letter addressed by Lord John Russell to the Duke of Wellington, the Chancellor of the University.

"No one will now deny that in the course of three centuries the increase of general knowledge, the growth of modern literature, the discoveries of physical and chemical science, have rendered changes in the course of studies at our national Universities highly

expedient. The Universities themselves have acknowledged this expediency, and very large reforms of this nature have been adopted, both at Oxford and at Cambridge. These improvements, so wisely conceived, reflect the highest credit on these learned bodies.

"The object of the proposed Commission is not to interfere with these changes, but to facilitate their progress; not to reverse the decisions of the Universities by an authority *ab extra*, but to bring the aid of the Crown, and, if necessary, of Parliament, to assist in their completion.

"This can be done in two ways: First, by ascertaining and recording, for the information of the Queen and both Houses of Parliament, the new regulations which have been promulgated, and the mode in which these regulations are expected to take effect.

"Secondly, by obtaining a knowledge of the obstacles which are interposed by the wills of founders, the retention of customs, and the decisions of competent authority, to the full development of that large and improved system of study which the Universities have sought to establish."

The letter of which the above is an extract, having been courteously acknowledged by the Duke, was sent to the Vice Chancellor, F. C. Plumptre, and the Board of the Heads of Houses, the local governing authority of the University, and drew from them a reply at length, closing with the following paragraph in opposition to the Commission.

"And without entering into the question of the legality of a Commission appointed only to inquire and report, it is obvious that it would be of the nature of an unconstitutional proceeding, since it would seek to obtain indirectly what could not be directly obtained without an open violation of the constitution, and of the rights and privileges of her Majesty's subjects. And we respectfully submit that her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects ought not to be exposed to the painful alternative of either withholding evidence from a Commission so appointed, lest they should betray their trust and sanction a proceeding apparently unconstitutional, or of allowing her Majesty's Commissioners to listen only to imperfect information or a partial statement upon subjects of great importance both to the Universities and the community at large."

On the other hand individual members of the corps of Professors, also the Heads of some of the Houses, and the

Visitors of some of the Colleges, professed a willingness to communicate the information desired, and to co-operate with the Commission. The Report makes a full statement of this fact in the following terms:

"The governing body has withheld from us the information which we sought from the University, through its Vice-Chancellor, as its chief resident officer; and this, as has been since intimated to us, for the purpose of disputing the legality of your Majesty's commission. We have had, however, the means of learning the opinions of the Heads of Houses, as a body, on several of the subjects which we have considered, and to some extent, the reasons which determined their conclusions." * * * *

"The Colleges of Morton, Lincoln, All Souls, Corpus, St. John's, and Pembroke, have supplied us with information. The Dean and Bursar of Balliol College have officially answered our inquiries. From the Heads of Magdalen Hall, St. Alban Hall, and St. Edmund Hall, we have received a similar compliance. Individual tutors of several other colleges have furnished us with information more or less complete. From the majority of the colleges, as societies, we have received no assistance."

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD is a corporate body, known by the title of "The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars, of the University of Oxford." It possesses the power of conferring degrees which are necessary to the attainment of many of the places of honor and emolument. It is one of the principal avenues to the ministry of the Episcopal Church. It takes part in the legislation of the country through its Representatives in Parliament. It is possessed of immense wealth, has a large patronage, and, in its press, has a large interest in a valuable monopoly.

It seems to be generally admitted that this Institution does not meet the wants of the British nation at the present time, and that in its constitution and laws, and course of study, it belongs to a by-gone age. It seems to be admitted also that it ought to be so modified that it shall be not only what it has claimed to be, "one of the eyes of England," but also that it shall speak what it knows to the British nation and to the world.

The question, therefore, has naturally been raised, where does the power to reform it lie? Does it lie with the Queen,

with the advice of her ministers; or with Parliament; or with the University; or with the particular Colleges? There are evidently great difficulties in making any radical changes. But of this more presently.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY is composed of nineteen Colleges and five Halls.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, said to be founded or restored by King Alfred in A. D. 872. In 1851 the number of undergraduates and commoners was 60, and about 55 reside within the walls. There are now twelve Fellows recognised by the statutes with equal privileges and emoluments. The Fellowships are worth about 190*l.* a year. The Mastership is said to be worth about 600*l.* a year. The number of Tutors, Assistant-Tutors, and Lecturers, was five. About fifty Lectures were given weekly. The average amount of Battels, provisions taken from the Buttery, in 1847 was 103*l.*

The course of studies for Candidates for Honors, included Thucydides, Herodotus, Livy, Tacitus, Aristotle's *Ethics*, *Rhetoric*, *Politics*, and *Organon*, Homer, *Æschylus* and *Aristophanes*, *Juvenal*, general Lectures on Greek and Roman History, and, occasionally, on Modern History. That prescribed for candidates for an ordinary degree, included *Sophocles*, *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Plato's Phædo*, *Virgil*, *Livy*, *Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, and *Sallust*. There were also Lectures for all the undergraduates on the Old Testament, the Gospels, the Acts, the xxxix. Articles, and, occasionally, on the Epistles.

BALLIOL COLLEGE was founded about the year 1262. The number of undergraduates in 1851 was 80: the total number of scholars was 334. The total revenue of the College was 5,896*l.* 9*s.* 11*d.* This College enjoys the singular privilege of electing its own visitor. The total income of the Master or Head of the College is about 800*l.* a year. There are ten Fellows. A Fellowship is worth about 220*l.* a year.

MERTON COLLEGE, founded in 1270. It consists of a Warden and 24 Fellows, and two Chaplains. In 1851 there were 35 undergraduates. The Visitor is the Archbishop of Canterbury. The annual income of the College is 7,220*l.* The present emoluments of the Warden, in money, are

1,050*l.* a year. The Fellows are elected by the Warden and thirteen Fellows.

EXETER COLLEGE, founded in the year 1815. The corporation consists of a Rector and 25 Fellows. The number of undergraduates in 1851 was 133. This college educates one-twelfth part of the undergraduates.

ORIEL COLLEGE, founded in 1324. There are 18 Fellows who receive 200*l.*, and 21 Scholarships. The number of undergraduates in 1851 was 87.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, founded 1340. The officers are a Provost, who receives 1,000*l.*; and 16 Fellows, who receive 300*l.* annually. The number of commoners in 1851 was 51.

NEW COLLEGE, founded in 1379, by William of Wykeham. He bound all the members by an oath to observe his statutes, and "all and singular the things therein contained, according to the plain, literal, and grammatical sense." The Fellows are 10 in number; the undergraduates were 8. The college presents to 37 benefices.

LINCOLN COLLEGE, founded 1427. There are a Rector, 12 Fellows, and 9 Scholars. In 1851 there were 40 commoners.

ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, founded 1438. There were to be 40 Fellows. Of these 24 were to study the Arts, or Philosophy, or Theology; and 16 the Canon or Civil Law.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE. (Pages wanting in the Report.) It was founded in 1459 by William Womfleet, Bishop of Winchester.

BRASENOSE COLLEGE. (Pages wanting.) It was founded in 1515, by William Smyth, Bishop of Lincoln.

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, founded in 1506. The number of Fellows is still 20. The number of undergraduates 6 or 7. The Head of the College receives 1000*l.*, and the Fellows 200*l.* The income of the College is 8,500*l.*

CHRIST-CHURCH COLLEGE, founded in 1526. It is governed by a Dean and eight Canons. The students are 101 in number. Forty-one juniors receive 25*l.*; 40 receive rather more than 30*l.*; and the senior twenty 45*l.* The number of undergraduates in 1850 was about 190.

TRINITY COLLEGE, founded in 1554. There are now twelve Fellows and thirteen Scholars. In 1851 the number of commoners was 67. There are 10 benefices in the gift of the College.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, founded in 1555. In 1851 there were 63 undergraduates, of whom 54 were commoners. Thirty benefices are in the gift of the College.

JESUS COLLEGE, founded in 1571. The number of Fellows is now 19; the number of Scholars 18. In 1851 there were 40 undergraduate commoners. The battels, including tuition and all college dues, range between 50*l*. and 80*l*.

WADHAM COLLEGE, founded in 1610. There are fifteen Fellowships and fifteen Scholarships. In 1851 there were 84 undergraduates.

PEMBROKE COLLEGE, founded in 1629. The total number of undergraduates in 1851 was 73. There are fourteen Fellowships and fourteen Scholarships.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, founded in 1714. The number of Fellows is 21. The number of Scholars is 16. In 1851 there were 28 undergraduate commoners; 8 undergraduate Fellow-commoners. There are four tutors. There are nine benefices in the gift of the College.

There are five HALLS, which differ from Colleges in that they have no charter, are not incorporated societies, are subject to statutes framed by the University, and have no endowments except their buildings, with a few Scholarships and exhibitions, which are held in trust by persons not necessarily connected with the Halls. In academical matters they, however, enjoy the same privileges nearly as the Colleges. They are allowed to receive undergraduates, and their emoluments are almost wholly derived from this source. The principals are, indeed, subject to the authority of the Hebdomadal Board, like the Heads of Colleges. The present halls are—

1. ST. MARY'S HALL, which, in 1851, had 52 undergraduates.
2. MAGDALENE HALL, which, in 1851, had 108 undergraduates.
3. NEW INN HALL, which, in 1851, had 33 undergraduates.
4. ST. ALBAN HALL, which, in 1851, had 7 undergraduates.
5. ST. EDMUND HALL, which, in 1851, had 23 undergraduates.

The ADMINISTRATION of the University was anciently in the hands of—

I. *The House of Congregation.* This was the real representative of the primeval Legislature of the literary republic of Oxford. The Legislature of the University in early times consisted of one house only, in which all the masters and teachers had a seat, called "the Congregation." The House was summoned by the sound of a bell, and met frequently. It confers all ordinary degrees which are now in form, what they were once in fact, licenses to teach.

II. *The House of Convocation.* This was composed of all who had attained a certain academical rank, whether they were or were not teachers. This body, called the "great Congregation," met only at intervals. This House was summoned by beadles. The House of Convocation, as comprehending the ever increasing number of those who were not teachers, and also as determining questions which were of interest to the whole academical community, became the more important of the two.

III. *The Chancellor,* elected by the Masters of each College.

IV. *Two Proctors.* They were elected by the whole body of the Masters of Arts.

This was the constitution of the administrative powers formerly.

At the present time, the administration is in the hands of—

I. *The Hebdomadal Board.* This consists of the Vice-Chairman, the twenty-three other Heads of Houses, and the two Proctors. The Heads of Houses had, as such, no statutable power in the University before the middle of the sixteenth century.

II. *The Chancellor.* He is elected by Convocation, from political considerations chiefly.

III. *The Vice-Chancellor.* He is nominated from the Heads of the Houses.

IV. *The House of Congregation.* Of the right of legislation, nothing now remains but that in it must be promulgated all statutes three days at least before they are proposed in Convocation.

V. *House of Convocation.* This consists, as formerly, of all Masters of Arts and Doctors, who have taken out their regency, and who are members of a College or Hall. It

possesses the power of debating on the measures proposed by the Hebdomadal Board, and by its acceptance these measures become statutes. It elects the Chancellor, the representatives of the University to Parliament, many of the Professors, and various University officers, while, on certain other appointments, it exercises a veto. To it belongs the ecclesiastical patronage of the University, and the right of conferring degrees out of the ordinary course.

The present constitution gives to the Vice-Chancellor singly, and to the two Proctors jointly, a veto on all the measures brought before Convocation.

Such, briefly, is the constitution of the University, as it was finally confirmed by King Charles the First and Archbishop Laud, and such it has ever since remained.

The Commission propose that the Congregation should be remodelled, and have its powers increased, so that it should be more nearly what it once was. They propose that the members of this remodelled Congregation should be the Heads of the Houses and Proctors, who would sit there as the Administrative powers of the University, together with the Professors and the public Lecturers, who are the authorized teachers; and that, in addition to these, the senior Tutor of each College shall have a seat. The Congregation, as thus constituted, would consist of more than one hundred members, and would be allowed to hold its deliberations in the English language, and not in the Latin, as at present. The duty of conferring degrees would still remain with the Congregation.

It also proposes that the Hebdomadal Board should remain and transact the ordinary business and maintain discipline, and that it should have the right, but not the exclusive right, of initiating measures to be submitted to the Congregation.

It also proposes that the House of Convocation, constituted as at present, should have the right to veto all the measures passed by the Congregation, and retain the right of electing the Chancellor of the University and the Burgesses.

It also proposes to lessen the powers of the Proctors, by taking from them the veto power, and the right of appointing examiners.

The number of students actually residing at Oxford at the present time is 1800. The annual number matriculated averages about 400. The number of persons who have passed the first examination for the degree of A.B. averages 287. The total number of members of the University in 1850 was 6060. The number of undergraduates resident and non-resident in 1850 was 1402. The number of members of Convocation was 3294. The remaining 1864 members were either graduates who had not yet acquired the franchise, or graduates who, having once lost it by removing their names from the books, have not yet recovered it by statutable means. The number of graduates, of all ranks, residing at Oxford, is about 300.

That the number of students educated at Oxford is not larger, is owing to the fact that, in the three learned professions, it furnishes a preparation to not very many, except to those who study theology. The great bulk of those who resort to Oxford are destined for the ministry of the church; and the number of students intended for holy orders would be much greater if the expenses were considerably reduced. The number of students at Cambridge is greater than at Oxford, though at Cambridge the accommodations within the College walls are more limited, and the endowments are much less considerable. This may be owing, in fact, to the greater facilities for admission into a good and popular College at Cambridge, together with the greater advantages thus afforded by open Fellowships and Scholarships. Another reason may be, that the examinations in that University can be more easily passed by persons who have not gone through a classical education. The absence, also, of a religious test at matriculation may sometimes cause a preference to be given to the sister University.

There is one practice in the instruction given in Oxford, as also in Cambridge, which deserves a passing notice. We refer to private tuition. "Private tutors are not recognised by name on the statutes of the University or of the Colleges. They are selected by the students. They often become their advisers and friends. The care, or at least the time, bestowed on each student by the private tutor, is greater than that which is bestowed by the College tutor. It is stated, upon good authority, that the sum annually spent

for private tuition at Cambridge amounts to 50,000*l*. At Oxford, the practice of resorting to private tutors is less general. Still, the annual sums thus spent must be large."

The following is a statement of the good and of the evil of such tuition:—

Of the system of private tuition the advantages are manifest. "The power of selection has great efficacy in attaching the pupil to the tutor, and I can speak from experience, that the tendency is strong to overrate the abilities and industry of a private tutor, a leaning not generally observed in the case of public tuition. The unfettered intercourse, the power of stating a difficulty without incurring ridicule, the greater equality of age and position, all tend to give the system efficacy. The system of private tuition is a necessary and unavoidable concomitant to any examination. No sooner were examinations established for the masters and mates of merchant ships, than there arose a class of men whose business it was to *cram* the candidates."

"The system of private tuition has, however, its defects. The persons into whose hands it principally falls are young men of unformed character, knowing little of the world, or probably of anything except the course of study by which they have gained distinction. Such is their influence from their position, that they are really forming the minds of the undergraduates before they have formed their own. As for the private tutors themselves, the practice is probably bad for them, since, as soon as they have taken their degrees, they are placed in a position which will tend to narrow the mind and generate habits of self-conceit."

The Commission expresses the belief that reliance must be placed mainly upon a return to the plan contemplated by the Laudian code, for improving the instruction in the Universities, shaping its application so as to meet the wants of the present time.

Colleges are defined as charitable foundations for the support of poor scholars with perpetual succession, devoting themselves to study and prayer, administering their own affairs under the presidency of a Head within, and the control of a Visitor without, according to statutes which were to be neither altered nor modified, and which were sanctioned by solemn oaths. Colleges were intended to be what they

are still, in the eye of the founders, Eleemosynary Foundations. William of Wykeham states, that next to his kinsmen, poor indigent clerks are to be admitted, because Christ, among the works of mercy, hath commanded men to receive the poor into their houses, and mercifully to comfort the indigent. In Queen's and New College, the Fellows are forbidden to keep dogs, on the ground that "to give dogs the bread of the children of men, is not fitting for the poor, especially for those who live on alms."

Colleges were founded for the purpose of affording to students a home in which they would be preserved from the turbulence and the licentiousness which in ancient times were almost always prevalent in the University. Fellows of college were to live together as members of a community. Founders intended that each of their Fellows should be improved by all in their daily intercourse. The rule of life in the earliest colleges was comparatively simple. It included, generally, common meals, during which the Bible was to be read, and silence kept; the use, in private as well as in public, of the Latin tongue, for which in Oriel and Queen's French, in Corpus Greek, in Jesus College Greek or Hebrew, might be substituted; uniformity of dress; strict obedience to the Head and college officers; terminal scrutinies for the purpose of inquiring into the life, modes, progress in learning, of the Fellows and other members of the college; and a system of surveillance to be carried on night and day by the seniors over the juniors. Celibacy was strictly imposed on the members of most colleges.

The purposes for which the indigent students were thus formed into a community, may be generally stated in the words of the older jurists, as related by Blackstone, to be *ad orandum et studendum*. The first purpose was that the Fellows should offer prayers for the living and the dead.

Moreover, each Fellow was bound, after completing his course in college, to proceed to one of the superior professions, generally that of theology. A few exceptions were made in favor of common or civil law; a still smaller number in favor of medicine, and at New College in favor of astronomy. To receive, then, and not to give instruction, was the business of the Fellows.

The founders of colleges sought to procure the perpetual

- observance of their statutes by placing them under the patronage of some great personage otherwise not connected with the college, who bore the name of Visitor. The Visitors are empowered, and in some cases earnestly entreated, to inspect the societies committed to their care from time to time, and to reform all abuses.

An examination of the condition of the colleges will show that there have been wide deviations from the purposes of the founders. The colleges are no longer eleemosynary. The Fellows are no longer bound to live as members of a community, subject to a strict rule of life. Since the Reformation, the legislature has prohibited masses and prayers for the dead. The main object of the endowment of colleges, namely, to support persons actually engaged in study, has been almost entirely set aside. The number of Fellows who reside for the purpose of study is very small. The Visitors of colleges have long since ceased to inquire into the condition of the communities committed to their care, and the observance of the statutes.

As already mentioned, the authorities of the University refused to give an account of the revenues to the Commissioners. It appears, however, that the colleges are in the receipt of about \$750,000 annually, exclusively of what is paid by the students.

In regard to the STATE OF DISCIPLINE, the Commissioners are of the opinion, 1. That the University should receive indemnification in case it has exceeded its power in altering the Laudean code, and should henceforth have full authority to make, abrogate, or alter the statutes with the exception of a few fundamental articles not to be altered without the consent of the Crown or some superior authority. 2. That the right of initiating measures should be confided to a body comprising the academical teachers as well as the members of the Hebdomadal Board. For this purpose it may be expedient that the body called the Congregation should be remodelled so as to consist of all Heads of Houses, the Proctors, all Professors and public lecturers, together with the senior tutors of all Colleges and Halls. 3. That the standing delegacies intrusted with executive functions, should be composed partly of members approved by the Congregation on the nomination of the Vice Chancellor and

Proctors, and that the Professors should be formed into a standing delegacy, and not liable to alteration, for the supervision of studies, the appointment of exercises, and the management of the public libraries. 4. That the Vice Chancellor should be appointed absolutely by the Chancellor from the Heads of Colleges. 5. That the tenure of the Proctor's office be extended to two years, and that their power of veto on acts of Convocation be abolished, and some of their other powers be limited. 6. That the imposition of promissory oaths for the performance of certain academical duties, should be prohibited. 7. That the distinction between noblemen, gentlemen commoners, and commoners, should be discontinued. 8. That certain legal checks be placed upon obtaining credit. 9. That the Vice Chancellor's court for the recovery of debts conform to other courts. 10. That the provision by which the students shall be required to belong to some College, or Hall, and that they shall all enter at a common gate, should be annulled, and that in some cases members of the University shall be permitted to live in private lodgings.

That as to the STUDIES, 1. That there should be a public examination for all the young men before matriculation. 2. That during the latter part of the academical course, the students should be left free to devote themselves to some special branch or branches of study. 3. That the Professors should be distributed into four Boards for the regular studies: I. Theology. II. Mental Philosophy or Philology. III. Jurisprudence and History. IV. Mathematical and Physical Science. 4. That restrictions on the appointment of Professors should be removed. 5. That the appointment of newly-created Chairs should be given to the Crown, but that the appointment to existing Professorships should be left in the same hands as at present, except that those vested in Convocation, in the graduates of Divinity, and in the Heads of Houses, should be transferred to Congregations. 6. That, to assist the Professors, assistant Professors or lecturers should be appointed, whenever necessary, by Boards to which they would respectively belong, subject to the approval of Congregation; that in case independent endowments cannot be furnished, a limited number of Fellows of colleges, if appointed to such lectureships,

should retain their Fellowships though married; and that Congregation should authorize the establishment of new Professorships, when they are wanted, or the suspension of those which may have ceased to be required. 7. That Professors and lecturers should be allowed to receive fees. 8. That the long vacation should commence and terminate on fixed days. 9. That the examinations should be conducted, as far as possible, in the vacations. 10. That steps should be taken to remove the restrictions which limit the usefulness of the University scholarships and prizes. 11. That the Bodleian library should be placed under the management of Professors; that the Professors be authorized, on special occasions, to grant permission that printed books and manuscripts be taken out of the building; that a reading room be provided with due accommodations. 12. That arrangements be made for transferring the department of physical science to the Radcliffe library. 13. That a catalogue be prepared of such books as are in the other libraries, but not in the Bodleian library. 14. That the University proceed with the plan lately brought forward for building a large museum of natural history, and that the trustees of present collections of various kinds should be empowered to transfer their collections to this museum.

That as to the REVENUES, 1. That there should be a balance-sheet of the revenues of the University printed annually, for the use of Convocation, and that the account books themselves should be accessible. 2. That the table of fees exacted by the University should be revised so as to equalize all fees demanded for the same purpose, and to abolish those which are demanded for no service, or which are unnecessary. 3. That the funds at the disposal of the University should be applied to University purposes only. 4. That the stamp duties levied on matriculation, on degrees, and on certificates of degrees, should be remitted.

That as to the COLLEGES, 1. That all oaths imposed by College statutes, and all declarations against change of statutes, should be prohibited as unlawful. 2. That all Fellowships should be thrown open to all members of the University, wherever born, provided they have taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and can produce a proper certificate of

character. 3. That persons elected to Fellowships should be released from all restrictions on the tenure of their Fellowships arising from the obligation to enter holy orders, or from that of proceeding to degrees in the faculties of Theology, Law, or Medicine; but that it would be expedient to modify rather than to remove the restrictions arising from the possession of property, and celibacy should still continue to be the necessary condition for holding Fellowships, with certain specified exceptions. 4. That steps should be taken in the various Colleges, to prevent the annual value of any Fellowship from amounting to more than 300*l*., or falling below 150*l*.. 5. That no part of the funds of Colleges, except those specifically given for that purpose, should be applied to the purchase of advowsons. 6. That in Colleges where there is more than one foundation, all Fellows should be placed on the same footing, both as to rights and duties. 7. That for the election of Fellows and Scholars in the larger Colleges, Boards should be formed, consisting of not less than twelve, and including the Head and all Fellows engaged in education. 8. That a certain number of Fellowships should be, for the present at least, appropriated for the encouragement of the new studies introduced into the academical system. 9. That if necessary, the Visitor should have power to issue a commission, for the re-examination of candidates for Fellowships, on appeal from rejected candidates. 10. That all Scholarships should be thrown open to British subjects under the age of nineteen, of whatever lineage and birth-place. The only exceptions to this are, that certain Scholarships in Jesus College should be reserved for persons born and educated in Wales, and that certain Scholarships in Colleges connected with particular schools should be reserved for persons educated at those schools. 11. That no Scholarships or exhibitions in the gift of Colleges, should be tenable for more than five years, and that in no case should a Scholarship lead to a Fellowship without fresh competition. 12. That College revenues should be made, to a certain extent, available for the education of the University, and that by the appropriation of funds given for Lectureships or Fellowships, Professorships should be endowed, in Corpus Christi, in Magdalen, Merton, Queen's, and New College. 13. That these Professor-Fellows should not be elected by the College-

electors, but that such Fellowships should follow the Professorships to which they may be respectively attached. 14. That the Heads of Colleges should be selected from any persons who have taken the degree of Master of Arts, and that the election to these offices should, if possible, be left to the Fellows of the College. 15. That in all cases the Visitors should be empowered to visit their Colleges and to correct abuses, and that the Visitors should be called upon to lay a copy of a report to be received from the Head of the College on the state, discipline, studies, and revenues of the College before the Sovereign, with such observations as he may think fit to make. 16. That the Head and Fellows in each society shall have power, under such control as may be thought expedient, to alter or abrogate statutes, and to frame new statutes as occasion may require.

These are the alterations which are proposed by the Commission.

The question naturally arises, where, if anywhere, does the power lie to make these alterations?

Does it lie with the College, or with the University, or with the Visitors, or with the Sovereign, or with Parliament?

The Colleges of Oxford were founded from the end of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the eighteenth, fourteen of the nineteen by Roman Catholics. As already remarked, they were founded for literary and religious purposes, and largely for the support of "poor and indigent college clerks, who are bound to apply themselves to the study of philosophy and theology according to the ordinances of the statutes." The celebration of prayers and masses for the souls of founders and benefactors, was, no doubt, an important collateral object with some of the Roman Catholic founders, but it does not appear that it was the chief object. All persons on the foundation previous to the Reformation were *clerici*.

But to return to the question asked above. According to the legal opinion expressed by Mr. Dampier, one of the Commission, "the power of allowing college statutes which exists elsewhere than in Parliament, is conjointly in the Sovereign, the Society, and in the founder's heir. If the Sovereign be the founder, or if there be no heir of the subject founder, the Sovereign and the Society are sufficient."

That some mode should be adopted, by which changes may be made in the administration of the University, appears to be the general wish of the intelligent portion of the people of Great Britain. And we are inclined to the opinion, that, notwithstanding the difficulties in the case, a way will either be discovered or made for accomplishing some of these changes. Our views on this point we reserve for another place.

Having presented our readers with a brief abstract from the Report of the Oxford University Commission, we proceed now to the second work at the head of this article. Mr. Bristed, after graduating with honor at Yale, and spending one year at New Haven as a resident graduate, entered the University of Cambridge, England, as a student in Trinity College, where he took one of the Scholarships, and where he remained five years. He thus had the best opportunities to form a correct opinion of the system of education in Cambridge. In his preface he remarks that he "writes this book for three reasons :

"First, very little is accurately known in this country about the English Universities.

"Secondly, most of what we have respecting those institutions, comes through the medium of popular novels and other light literature, frequently written by non-University men, and almost always conveying an erroneous and unfavorable idea of the Universities.

"Thirdly and principally, there are points in an English education which may be studied with profit, and from which we may draw valuable hints."

We introduce this book to our readers, not for the purpose of criticism to which it is open, but to carry out the object of the writer, and assist our readers to form a correct idea of education as carried on in an English University. Many of the statements contained in this article in respect to Oxford, will apply to Cambridge with certain specific differences, so that the second work may serve as a comment upon the first.

On the second page we have a description of a college structure :—

" You enter, then, by a portal neither particularly large nor very

striking in its appearance, but rather the reverse, into a spacious and elegant square. There are neat grass plots and walks, a fountain in the centre; on one side stands a well proportioned chapel, in one corner you catch a glimpse through a tantalizing grating of a beautiful garden, appropriated to the delectation of the authorities. In a second court you find sounding and venerable cloisters, perhaps a veritable structure of monkish times; if not, a satisfactory imitation of that period. And as you look on the walls, here rich with sculptured ornaments, there covered with trailing and festooning ivy, the theory and the idea of a college edifice begin to strike you: its front is inside for its own benefit; it turns its back upon the vulgar outside. But you have not yet fathomed and sounded the spirit of seclusion. The entries are narrow and low; the staircases narrow and tortuous; the iron bound doors closed by some mysterious spring; or open only to show another door within, look like portals to a feudal dungeon. But up those break-neck staircases, and inside those formidable doors (sometimes with the additional preliminary of a small dark passage), are luxurious suites of rooms, not exactly like those of a Parisian hotel, or a 'double house' in the Fifth Avenue, but quite as beautiful and much more comfortable. The apartments and the entrance seem made in inverse proportion to each other; a mere hole in the wall sometimes leads you to half a house of rooms; and most cosy rooms they are, with their prodigiously thick walls, that keep out the cold in winter, and the heat, when there is any, in summer; their impregnable *sporting doors* that defy alike the hostile dun and the too friendly 'fast man,' and all their quaint appurtenances, such as book-cases of the true scholastic sort, sunk into and forming a part of the wall, so that it would not be easy to appropriate them or the space they occupy to any other purpose; queer little nooks of studies, just large enough to hold a man in an arm chair and a big dictionary; unexpected garrets which the very occupant of the rooms never goes into without an air of enterprise and mystery, and which the old priests used for oratories—perhaps; the modern Cantabs keep their wine in them."—Pp. 2, 3.

"Studying in vacation! Even so; for you may almost take it for granted as a general rule that college regulations and customs in England are just the reverse of what they are in America. In America you rise and recite to your instructor who is seated; in England you sit and construe to him as he stands at his desk. In America you go sixteen times a week to chapel or woe be to you; but then you may stay out of your room all night for a week together, and nobody will know or care. In England you have about eleven chapels to keep, and may choose your own time of

day, morning or evening, to keep them ; but you cannot get out of college after ten at night, and if being out, you stay till after twelve, you are very likely to hear of it next morning. In America you may go about in any dress that does not outrage decency, and it is not uncommon for youths to attend chapel and 'recitation room' in their ragged dressing gowns, with perhaps a pretext of a cloak ; in England you must scrupulously observe the academical garb while within the college walls, and not be too often seen wearing white great coats or other eccentric garments under it. In America the manufacture of coffee in your room will subject you to suspicion, and should that bugbear, the tutor, find a bottle of wine on your premises, he sets you down as a hardened reprobate ; in England you may take your bottle or two or six with as many friends as you please, and unless you disturb the whole court by your exuberant revelry, you need fear no annoyance from your tutor ; may expand your supper into a stately dinner, and he will come (public tutor or private) like a brick as he is, and consume his share of the generous potables, yea take a hand in your rubber afterwards. In America you may not marry, but your tutor can ; in England you may marry, but he can't. In America you never think of opening a book in vacation ; in England the vacations are the times when you read most. Indeed since vacations occupy more than half of the year, he who keeps them idle will not do much work during his college course. Then in vacation, particularly the long, there is every facility for reading—no large dinner or wine or supper parties, no rowing men making a noise about the courts, no exciting boat-races, no lectures (owing to the private-tutorial system, the public lectures, with some happy exceptions, are rather in the way of than any help to the best men), the chapel rules looser than ever, the town utterly dull and lifeless."—Pp. 77, 78.

"The private tutor at an English University, corresponds, as has been already observed, in many respects to the *professor* at a German. The German professor is not necessarily attached to any specific chair ; he receives no fixed stipend, and has not public lecture-rooms ; he teaches at his own house, and the number of his pupils depends on his reputation. The Cambridge private tutor is also a graduate, who takes pupils at his rooms in numbers proportionate to his reputation and abilities. And although while the German professor is regularly licensed as such by his University, and the existence of the private tutor *as such* is not even officially recognised by his, still this difference is more apparent than real ; for the English University has *virtually* licensed the tutor to instruct in a particular branch by the standing she has given him in her examinations.

But the private tutor's office is somewhat peculiar in the details of instruction, owing to the causes which first called the system into being, and now perpetuate it.

"The publicity given to College and University honors, and the importance assigned to them, have been already more than once alluded to. They exceed anything of which we have any conception in our academical institutions. True, the publicity does not come in the same way; there is no crowding of commencements to hear the young men make speeches; but if a comparatively small number of the public come to gaze at the successful student, his name goes forth to all who read the papers—for in every newspaper not only the results of the degree examination and the University prizes, but all the College examinations, and College prizes, are conspicuously reported. When I was elected Scholar of Trinity, Dr. Whewell thought it worth while to write express to Mr. Everett, announcing the fact in advance of the press; as if our minister would be justified in regarding it as a national matter. When an acquaintance of mine, who was related to a member of the cabinet, wished for a start in the diplomatic line, the statesman's first advice to him was, be sure to get a wranglership! As to the first men of the year there is no end of the celebrities for the time being."—Pp. 146, 147.

But besides the reputation, success in Scholarship brings with it "solid testimonies in the shape of books, plate, or money." A Trinity scholarship is worth from £60 to £40 a year. Some of the small College scholarships are worth £100 a year. A Fellowship gives an income of from £200 to £400. "A friend of mine was during his third year, between school exhibitions, College scholarships and prizes, and the University scholarship, in the receipt of more than *seventeen hundred* dollars." "Indeed, it is a common saying and hardly an exaggerated one, that a poor student, by taking a high degree, supports, not only himself, but his mother and sisters for life."

"The purpose served by a private tutor is to assist a student to supply any deficiencies in his preparation for entering the University; and to direct the study so that it shall not be wasted. An ordinary tutor takes five or six pupils a day, giving an hour to each. One of great celebrity will take twice as many, if a classic, or four times as many, if a mathematician."

"The student reading with a classical tutor translates to him from some (prepared) author, brings him composition prepared at home, and writes out in the tutor's rooms, examination fashion, both translations and compositions, which after being corrected, are compared with the tutor's models. As much of the pupil's reading must be done by himself, the great object of the tutor is composition, but he also serves as a general commentator, and last resort in difficulties; it is also his business to make selections of hard passages from authors whom the student may not have time and inclination to read the whole of, and to point out the proper books for 'cram,' and philological information."—P. 149.

The regular fee of a private tutor is £7 a term, if you go to him on alternate days, or £14 if every day.

The following is the account which he gives of Eton College:

"It is a singular spectacle for an American to see numbers of youths eighteen or nineteen years old, who, in his own country, would call themselves and be called young men, leaders of fashionable society, perhaps—going about in boyish costume, and evidently in the *status* of boys. What increases the singularity of the appearance is, that the Englishman's physical development is more rapid than that of the American, of the Northern States at least; thus the Etonian of nineteen is as old in appearance as the New Yorker and Bostonian of twenty-one. They all wear white cravats and black beavers; caps are forbidden, otherwise there is no uniformity of costume, and the juvenile round jacket is as common as the manly coat upon strapping young fellows nearly six feet high. Still, however you may *dress* persons of that age, it is not possible to confine them fully to the discipline of boys; the upper forms *will* walk out into the town of Windsor, and should one of them meet a tutor, he takes refuge in a shop, the tutor, by a long established fiction, making believe not to see him."

"There are always several hundred boys at Eton; at that period (1845) it numbered more than seven hundred. About one-tenth of these are Collegers. The Collegers are the nucleus of the whole system, and the only original part of it, the paying pupils (*oppidans*, *town boys*), being, according to the general belief, an after-growth. They (the Collegers) are educated gratuitously, and such of them as have nearly, but not quite reached the age of nineteen, when a vacancy in King's College, Cambridge, occurs, are elected scholars

there forthwith, and provided for during life—or until marriage.”
—P. 262.

We have the following account of Dr. Whewell. “Dr. Whewell’s accession to the Mastership of Trinity might well have been an era in the history of that royal and religious institution” :—

“The new head was a gentleman of most commanding personal appearance, and the very sound of his powerful voice betokened no ordinary man. He was a remarkably good rider even in a country of horsemen, and the anecdote was often told and not altogether repudiated by him, how in his younger days, about the time of his ordination, a pugilist, in whose company he accidentally found himself while travelling, audibly lamented that such lusty thews and sinews should be thrown away on a parson.”—P. 87.

“A young man who enters there (Cambridge), and is disposed to find a *truly* ‘good set,’ can find one, or indeed form his choice among several sets of really virtuous and religious men. It was my comfort to know many right worthy of the name of Christians according to the highest standard that was ever lived up to ; men of no particular clique or theological school, but holding various opinions and coming from various places and teachers ; pupils of Arnold from Rugby ; Evangelicals from King’s College, London ; other King’s College London men of the eclectic stamp, followers of Professor Maurice, who, looked at from a Presbyterian point of view, might be called high churchmen ; Eton men, who were yet more eclectic, and had trained themselves *nullius jurare in verba magistri*. Men who differed in many things, but agreed in being sincere Christians, whether you regarded their faith or their practice ; and whose conduct strikingly exemplified that common sense of religion, which is so conspicuous in the writings of Whately, Arnold, and other liberal Churchmen, and of which a really good Englishman, when you find one, presents the very best specimen in his life. They seemed every day to solve that most difficult problem of ‘being in the world, not of it.’”—P. 352.

We shall in our next number resume the subject of English education.

ART. IV.—THE VIEWS OF DR. NEVIN AND HIS PARTY
OF THE GERMAN REFORMED COMMUNION RESPECTING
THE DOCTRINES AND WORSHIP OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE German Reformed Messenger, Chambersburg, of December 15, 1852, contained a passionate denunciation of the statement in the Journal for October, that "in the Episcopal and German Reformed churches parties have risen who openly favor the doctrines of Romanism, exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures, and rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart, and on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings." This the writer pronounces, "at least so far as the German Reformed church is concerned, a most unqualified and totally unwarranted untruth," and a "foul slander." "What!" he exclaims, "parties in the German Reformed church who openly favor Romanism! exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures! rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart! and on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings! *The whole assertion is a sheer fabrication from beginning to end;*" and he proceeds in a strain of insolence seldom equalled in the most excited and unscrupulous effusions of the political press, to vent his rage at what he calls "the vile falsehood," and express his surprise that the "lightnings of heaven" had not instantly blasted the hand that penned it. The audacity and rancor of this disclaimer, however, instead of giving it credibility, are suited to excite a distrust of its rectitude. Ingenuous witnesses for the truth, who are conscious of their innocence and the rightfulness of their cause, are not accustomed to utter their defences of themselves from misapprehension and aspersion in such ferocious tones. It is characteristic rather of the vassals of the beast from the earth that had "horns like a lamb," but that "spake as a dragon." If the writer truly thought the statement in the Journal a misrepresentation, it still gave no just occasion for such a storm of rage and vituperation. He knew that the belief is not peculiar to us,

that a party exists in the German Reformed church who openly favor the doctrines of Romanism. He was aware also that ours was not the first expression of that belief. So far from it, it has been repeatedly intimated in the religious newspapers especially, for a number of years; it has been the subject of much discussion in theological circles; and the conviction that Dr. Nevin, and some of his co-laborers in the Mercersburg Review, have apostatized from the Protestant to the Romish faith, has been unreservedly avowed by many whose intelligence, impartiality, and friendliness to the German Reformed communion, preclude the suspicion that they are prompted by sinister motives. The fact indeed that such a conviction is felt and expressed by a large number, the Editor himself acknowledges. "It would seem," he says, "from the course which has recently been taken on the part of at least a portion of the religious press with reference to the German Reformed church, that she is destined in the providence of God to be the object of *malicious hate and violent persecution on the part of a deliberately organized combination without*, made up of white spirits, black and grey, whose purpose it is *to crush her, and blot her totally out of existence if possible.*" The apprehension then that Dr. Nevin and his party favor the doctrines of Romanism is no novelty, nor is the public avowal of it. They are of long standing. "At least a portion of the religious press" has frequently put forth much the same representation as that of the Journal, and it has met so general a credence that—if this writer is to be believed—a "combination" has been "deliberately organized," "whose purpose it is to crush" the German Reformed church, because of her alleged apostasy, "and blot her, if possible, out of existence." The fact is thus admitted that the conviction very extensively prevails in other denominations, and has for a considerable time, that Dr. Nevin and his party have embraced the doctrines of the Romish church; the editor of the Messenger, therefore, after having been so long familiar with it, should have recovered from the tempest of passion which the first public announcement of it may have occasioned, and possessed himself of some better weapons for the defence of himself and his compeers, than mere coarse abuse and malignant traduction.

It is the consideration, however, not improbably, that this conviction has become so general and deeply seated, and that it is no longer easy to keep up to the general eye an air of Protestantism, that has prompted this ebullition of rage. It is thought, perhaps, to be the most efficient method of repressing the doubts and alarms of those in their communion, whom they wish to retain still longer under their influence, and of deterring "the religious press" from "intermeddling" with their "onward course" in the propagation of their peculiar doctrines. Whether, however, it was got up for that purpose, or the writer persuades himself, that although Dr. Nevin and his co-laborers openly sanction the doctrines and worship of the Romish church from the fourth and fifth centuries to the Reformation, and represent them as essential elements of Christianity itself for that long period, they nevertheless do not now assign them that character, but hold instead the faith of the communion to which they belong—his disclaimer is, too palpably to admit of debate, altogether hollow and untrustworthy. It is absurd to suppose that the large body of intelligent, upright, and religious men in the different communions that surround and are intermixed with the German Reformed church, who, enjoying the most ample means for forming a just judgment on the subject, regard Dr. Nevin and his party as having adopted the doctrines of the Romish church, have yielded to that conviction, as the Editor of the *Messenger* would have us believe, not only without any justifiable reason, but against the most indisputable and abundant evidence. No man of sense will believe it. It is not possible. There is no imaginable influence that could have produced such a result. It is still more preposterous to imagine that they have been prompted to the avowal of that conviction by the gratuitous hate and malice with which this Editor represents them as animated, and the diabolical purpose, if possible, to crush the German Reformed church, and blot her from existence. This atrocious detraction defeats itself by its senselessness and enormity. No man can for a moment persuade himself that these persons are actuated, in any degree, by such a malicious feeling. There is no conceivable motive that could prompt them to such a causeless and malignant misrepresentation of the German Reformed church. What have they

to gain from a wanton detraction; what benefit can they derive from an annihilation of that large and respectable communion? What more exorbitant solecism could this writer propose to the faith of his readers, than that these persons, whom he represents as the devotees of a most narrow-minded and selfish Protestantism, are, nevertheless, inflamed with a rabid wish for a disastrous eclipse and decline of their own cause; that they are animated with a suicidal purpose, from the mere love of evil, to strike from existence an important branch of their own party? The Editor of the Messenger has then, in this enormous detraction, overleaped his object. So exorbitant a fiction bespeaks the unreliableness of his whole disclaimer; and this he accordingly directly demonstrates in his next column, in an article on "The Mercersburg Review on the Church Question," in which he expressly and emphatically sanctions the whole of the views advanced by Dr. Nevin on that subject, and quotes, with approval, passages from his essays on Cyprian, in which Dr. N. avers that "we must either make *all previous Christianity*," back from the Reformation, "to the time of the Apostles, a *Satanic apostasy and delusion*; or else we must resort to the theory of historical development by which *the Catholic form of the church*"—including all the false doctrines and rites of Romanism which we represented him and his party as having embraced—"shall be regarded as the natural and legitimate course of its history"—that is, the history of Christianity—"onward to the time of the Reformation, and the state of things since"—in the several branches of the church, of course, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Greek—"be taken as a more advanced stage of that same previous life struggling forward to a still higher and far more glorious consummation in time to come." Had we asked the Editor of the Messenger to pen a specific and emphatic acknowledgment and assertion of the truth of every element of our statement, he could scarcely have wrought one, as will be shown in the course of our discussion, more absolute and effective than this.

The pretence, then, that our statement is either a "foul" and malignant "slander," or in any measure "unwarrantable," is so notoriously false, and is so amply disproved by the Editor himself in the sheet in which he uttered it, that

we should scarcely deem it worth while to recur to the subject for the mere purpose of vindicating ourselves from his detraction. We have a higher reason for it. That such an apostasy has taken place in that communion, is an event of great interest to other Protestant churches; and the fact that its true character is boldly and passionately denied, and great efforts are made to disguise its anti-christian features under Protestant names, renders it peculiarly important that its nature, and the proofs that demonstrate it, should be clearly unfolded, and the principle especially which lies at its foundation thoroughly understood; that, if possible, those who have been led astray may be induced to retrace their steps, and that others, at least, may be protected from the dangers to which they are exposed of being beguiled by the arts of these false teachers.

We shall state then, first, the notion of God and the universe which Dr. Nevin and his party make the basis of their speculations, respecting Christianity and the church; next, the views they entertain of Christ and the church; thirdly, their theory of development by which they represent all the varying doctrines, rites of worship, and religious and moral practices of the church at its several periods, as true constituents and the substance itself of Christianity at those periods, and the real and only exponents of its genuine nature; and, finally, we shall show that among those doctrines, rites of worship, and practices, which they thus exhibit as essential elements of Christianity; they expressly enumerate those of the Romish church, which we represented them as having embraced.

The speculative basis on which their theory of Christianity and the church rests, is that species of pantheism which was entertained by Schelling. Morell and Tennemann say of Schelling's system:—

“The foundation stone upon which the whole rests is *the absolute and infinite existence*, which forms of itself *the whole real essence of the universe*.”—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, p. 438.

“There exists but *one identical nature*, and merely a quantitative difference exists between objects *quoad essentiam*, resulting from the preponderance of the objective or subjective, the ideal or real. The finite has only an apparent existence, inasmuch as it is the product

of merely relative reflection. The *one absolute nature* reveals itself in the eternal generation of existing things, which, on their part, constitute the *forms* of that nature. Consequently, each individual being is a revelation of *absolute being* in a determinate form. Nothing can exist which does not participate in *the Divine being*. Consequently, the natural world is not *dead*, but animated and divine, no less than the ideal."—*Tennemann's Hist. Phil.*, p. 442.

Though Dr. Nevin has made no formal statement, so far as we have observed, of his views on this subject, he abundantly indicates that he entertains this pantheistic theory. Thus, he says—

"It is not *the absolute* as such simply, but the absolute in the form of *self-revelation*, *God in the world*, God unfolding his glory, before which our spirits are required to bow. In this view, *nature itself* may be the object of reverence; not on its own account outwardly considered, but as it serves to manifest to the view of faith the sublime presence, the wonderful attributes of him *who dwells in it*, and makes it the perpetual mirror of his glory. . . . The universe of nature as a whole, and in all its parts, is not merely the sign of *what God is*, but the very *symbol and sacrament of his presence*, a *true revelation*, as far as it goes, of his *eternal power and Godhead*. . . . As in the case of *nature*, so too in the world of mind, the *individual existence is comprehended* always in the bosom of the *whole* to which it belongs. God reveals himself in the form of *self-acting spirit*, not by inspiring truth and law into every man separately taken, . . . but by a single inspiration, rather, or breath, of the Almighty, which is at once as broad and full as the compass of our *whole humanity*" [and because, on his theory, instead of separate individuals, they are but a specific portion of the divine nature made finite in that form].—*Dr. Nevin's Baccalaureate Address*, 1850, pp. 8–10.

Their systems, in respect to the absolute and the finite, are thus the same. No one would entertain these ideas, or use these forms of expression, who was not a pantheist of the school of Schelling. This is the theory also advanced by Dr. Bushnell, and made the basis of his system.

"When God is revealed, it cannot be as the One, as the Infinite or Absolute, but only as through media; and as there are no infinite

media, no signs that express the Infinite, no minds, in fact, that can apprehend the Infinite by direct inspection, the One must appear in the *manifold*, the Absolute in the *conditioned*, Spirit in *form*; the motionless in motion; the Infinite in the finite. He must distribute himself; he must let forth his nature in sounds, colors, forms, works, definite objects and signs.

"Thus, the God revealed, in distinction from the God Absolute, will have *parts, forms, colors, utterances, motions, activities* assigned him. He will think, deliberate, reason, remember, have emotions."

... "Conceive him now as creating the world; or creating worlds from eternity. In so doing he only represents, expresses, or *outwardly produces himself*. He bodies out his own thoughts. What we call the creation is, in another view, a revelation only of God, his first revelation."—*God in Christ*, pp. 139, 146.

This theory thus differs nothing from that of Dr. Nevin; nor is there any difference in the mode in which it is exhibited, except that Dr. Bushnell states directly and specifically the reason for which he holds that God manifests himself in that manner, while Dr. Nevin merely asserts it as a fact.

If the universe is thus nothing but God in limited forms, it is manifest that man is but a form of God, in which two dissimilar natures, a material and an intellectual, are united. That is the theory, accordingly, of Schelling. He represents the law "by which the Absolute, and everything else as being a manifestation of the Absolute, proceeds in its self-development," as comprehending a reflective movement which is "an attempt of the Infinite to embody or represent itself in the finite," and a subsumptive movement which is "the attempt that the Absolute makes, having embodied itself in the finite, to return to the Infinite."

"By the first movement it embodies its own infinite attributes in the finite. In doing this, it produces finite *objects*, i. e. finite reflections of itself, and thus sees itself objectified in the forms and productions of the material world. This first movement then gives rise to the philosophy of *nature*. The second movement is the regress of the finite into the Infinite; it is nature again making itself absolute, and re-assuming the form of the Eternal. The result of this movement is *mind* as existing in man, which is nothing else than nature gradually raised to a state of consciousness, and attempting

in that way to return to its infinite form. This gives rise to transcendental idealism, the philosophy of mind."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, pp. 438, 439.

This phase of pantheism is presented by Dr. Nevin in the following form :

"Man carries in his constitution the *life* of two worlds. Under one aspect he belongs to the system of *nature*, as it stands revealed to him in the forms of space and time. The *organism* of nature completes itself in time, as its proper consummation and head. . . . By his senses and appetites he is bound to it through the whole course of his history, as *the necessary ground and substratum of his very being*. . . . But this is only one side of our constitution. Under another aspect man belongs, by *original and native right*, to a higher order of existence, *the purely spiritual world*, as it lies *beyond nature* altogether [that is, as it exists in the Absolute], and includes in itself laws and powers to which mere nature can never ascend."—*Address*, p. 2.

The systems thus coincide on this point. They use the term nature in the same sense ; they present the same view of the relation of finite intelligences both to nature and to the Absolute. If material nature is now "the substratum of man's being," his "spiritual nature" *originally* belonged to the Absolute, "which lies altogether beyond nature."

But if man is thus a part of the Divine essence in a finite form, it would seem natural to conclude that intellectually, at least, he presents an image of God. This is the doctrine, accordingly, of Schelling.

"Man is the summit of the creation—he is that part of it in which the Absolute sees himself most fully portrayed as the perfect *image or type of the infinite reason*. In him objective creation has taken the form of subjectivity ; and hence he is said, in contradistinction to everything else, to have been formed *in the image of God*."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, p. 450.

The same view is presented by Dr. Nevin.

"God reveals himself in the world, not merely by outward symbols which themselves have no part in the life of spirit, and so are shadows only of *the divine substance they are made to enshrine* ; but

still more gloriously also through *the world of mind itself*, in virtue of which *the very image and likeness of his own nature* looks forth upon us from the bosom of the universe under a *created form*. This is entitled to our reverence always, not only as the shrine of something higher, but also for its own sake; though only for its own sake again, of course, as it is felt to be *comprehended in that which is more general than itself separately considered*, and so finally in the *UNIVERSAL MIND ITSELF, forth from which, as a parent fountain, all other minds proceed.*"—*Address*, p. 9.

Man is thus a part of "the Divine substance," differing from the Infinite only in that he is in a finite form, and he presents an exact image of the "Universal and Infinite Mind" in which he is "comprehended."

But if the human is thus a part of the Divine mind, formed in its image and essentially like it *in its constitution*, it would seem natural to presume that it must have a faculty of knowledge at least somewhat like omniscience, or possess a power of discerning spiritual realities independently of the senses. Such a power is accordingly ascribed to it by Schelling.

"With him the great organ of philosophy is *intellectual intuition*, by means of which faculty he supposes we have an immediate knowledge of *the Absolute*. This intellectual intuition is a kind of higher and spiritual sense, through which we *feel the presence of the infinite both within and around us*; moreover, it affords us a species of knowledge which does not *involve the relation of subject and object*, but enables us to gaze at once by the eye of the mind upon *the eternal principle itself*, from which both proceed, and in which thought and existence are absolutely identified."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, p. 436.

The same notion is entertained by Dr. Nevin, except that he employs *faith* instead of *intuition* as the name of this perceptive power.

"This communication with the spiritual world is accomplished by *faith*; which is simply the *capacity or organ* our nature carries in itself as spirit for *perceiving and apprehending spiritual things*, the realities of a *higher world*, as *sense is the organ* through which we stand in union with things *seen and temporal*. It forms emphatically

thus the bond that joins us in a real and living way, with the *pleroma* of life in God, and it is easy to see how immeasurably needful it is that it should be always at hand as an open channel, through which fresh supplies of light and strength from that boundless fountain may be poured into our souls, to fit them for the work and conflict to which they are called. . . .

"This personal enlargement involves a real participation in the life and power of the invisible world itself, towards which the soul thus erects itself by the power of faith. It is not in imagination only, but in the way of actual fact that it passes over the limits of nature, and connects itself with the vast spiritual economy which lies beyond." —*Address*, pp. 3, 4.

This faith is thus, not an *act*, nor a *power* of exerting acts of belief or trust, but is, instead, an *intuitional organ*, or *capacity of perceiving and apprehending the pleroma of God*, "in a real and living way," independently of media; and coincides with the "intellectual intuition" of Schelling, and the intuitional consciousness of Schleiermacher and Morell.

If the worlds of matter, life, and mind, are thus only *modes* of the Deity, or God, in finite forms, it is manifest that if there is a recognition and homage of God by men, it must be a recognition and homage of him as existing in these forms. This is seen from the fact, that according to the theory, God had no personality, nor consciousness even, until he had unfolded himself in finite forms. Thus Schelling taught that:—

"The Absolute essence had become everything, and its development was not the free and designed operation of intelligence, but rather a blind impulse working first unconsciously in nature, and only arriving to *self-consciousness* in *mind*. On this principle all difference between God and the universe was entirely lost, his pantheism became as complete as that of Spinoza. . . .

"The primary form of the Absolute is *will* and *self-action*. It is an absolute power of becoming in reality, what it is in the germ. The second form in which it appears, is that of *being*, in the realization of its will or power indicated to be possible. But as yet there is no *personality*, no *Deity* properly so called. For this we must add the further idea of freedom, which is the *power* which the Absolute possesses of *remaining* either in its first or its second potency, as above stated. In this unity, which contains the three ideas of *action*,

of existence, and of freedom, consists the proper idea of God. God, before the existence of the world, is the undeveloped *impersonal*, absolute essence from which all things proceed; it is only *after* this essence is developed and has passed successively into the three states respectively of action, of objective existence, and of freedom, that he attains *personality*, and answers to the proper notion of Deity."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, pp. 449, 450.

Dr. Nevin exhibits the same notion of the personality of the Deity as predicable of him only as developed in finite existences, in contradistinction from his existence as the Absolute.

"All reverence carries in it an acknowledgment of God, as its *ultimate object and ground*; and it involves also *essentially*, the *conception* of God, as an *intelligent personal* being, and not *simply* in the form of an infinite *abstraction* [which is the form in which he is conceived as the Absolute], even when this may not be *clearly perceived*, and the mind seems to be overwhelmed only with the *sense* of the *Absolute* as a merely *natural power* [the power of nature], the true interior spring of its emotion is still always the *obscure apprehension of a divine LIFE* behind this, which is felt to underlie all in the character of self-existent *THOUGHT* and *WILL*. Such an emotion, even in the breast of a Spinoza, is the involuntary tribute of the human spirit to the fountain of its own life, which serves of itself to demonstrate, against all intervening speculation, its true living reality, as the *self-conscious ground* of the universe."—*Address*, pp. 7, 8.

He thus indicates as clearly as Schelling that he regards the personality and the self-consciousness of the Deity, as resulting altogether from his embodying himself in finite forms. If such is the fact, then, it is undoubtedly in this relation, chiefly, that he is to be contemplated as an object of reverence and worship. This, accordingly, is the definition given of religion by Schleiermacher, who was a pantheist essentially of the school of Schelling.

"The contemplation of the pious man is only his immediate *consciousness of the universal being of everything finite in the Infinite* and through the Infinite, of everything temporal in the Eternal and through the Eternal. To seek this [mode of being] and to find it in all that lives and moves, in all production and change, in all

action and suffering; to possess and to acknowledge life itself in immediate feeling, only as *this mode of existence*;—*this is religion*. When this is found, *religion* is satisfied. When this is concealed, religion perceives only limitation and agony, wretchedness and death. Religion is, accordingly, *a life in the infinite nature of the universe*, in one and all, in God, possessing and enjoying *all* in God, and God in *all*.”—*Mr. E. Ripley's Third Letter to Professor Norton*, p. 25.

“According to Schleiermacher, religion is a deep emotion of the mind arising from the absorption of the man, the individual man, in the infinite. ‘The universe,’ he remarks, ‘is in one uninterrupted activity, and manifests itself to us every moment. Every *form* which it brings forth; every *being* to whom, according to the fulness of life, it gives a separate existence; every *event* which it shakes out of its rich and ever-fruitful bosom, is a working of the same upon us; and to grasp *every single thing*, not for itself, but as a *part of the whole*, to view everything limited, not in its opposition to anything else, but as a *manifestation of the infinite in our life*; and to give ourselves up to the emotion thus occasioned;—*this is religion*.’ The one and all in religion is to perceive everything which moves us in feeling, in its *highest unity*, as *one* and *the same*, and everything particular and singular, as only existing through this [one]; consequently, to regard our life and being, as a *life and being in God*.”—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, pp. 617.

This is the view also entertained by Dr. Nevin:—

“The authority which freedom respects and obeys, is, of course, always the will of God. All law, as well as life, comes from this source alone. It must be well borne in mind, however, that we have to do with this, not as an abstraction brought nigh to us immediately in the way of mere thought [that is, as the Absolute], but as an *actual self-manifestation of God's will in the living world, of which we are a part*. To believe in God, is, as we have seen, to *discern and apprehend his presence and glory in nature, in history, in the bible*, and above all in *Christ*; not to dream of him *simply as an unrevealed essence [the Absolute], beyond the clouds*, which can only be to sport the semblance of faith with what is, at least, but the creature of our own brain. So, also, we have seen, reverence towards God is the profound homage of the created spirit rendered to him, not as the incomprehensible *Sige* or *Bythos* simply of the Gnostics, but as the omnipresent indwelling *Life* of the *universe*, whose mind and will are perpetually announcing themselves in a real way as the very word or voice of Jehovah, first in the *constitution of nature*,

and then far more gloriously in *the constitution of SPIRIT*, both wedded into a single life in *the constitution of MAN*. . . .

"The manly independence of a truly free mind springs always from the apprehension of God's presence and authority, as something *concretely revealed in the actual life of the world*, and from *this apprehension only*. The law which it is urged willingly to obey, as a *power more vast than itself* [that is, as developed in a larger portion of the Deity], is felt to surround it as an awful spiritual reality, in *the constitution of NATURE*. . . . But it is in the presence of SPIRIT far more *under its own form*, CREATED MIND, *the intellectual and moral world*, as not only the symbolic shadow, or mirror, but the very *image and SUBSTANCE* of the Divine Mind itself, that such *homage* finds its full value and sense."—*Address*, pp. 15, 17.

The material and intellectual universe or God in limited forms and finite intelligences, is thus, according to him, the only personal and conscious deity that exists, and thence is the proper and the only proper object of religious reverence and worship. The very essence of religion consists in the belief and acknowledgment of this pantheism. Among the various forms that make up this materialized and intellectual universe that is to be worshipped, man is especially an object of religious reverence and homage. Dr. Nevin says:—

"Man in his single capacity becomes an object of *veneration* even with angels, because his personality, constituted by reason and will, sets him in real union with the very being of spirit under its *universal form*, and makes him to be something far more, in this view, than his own *individual life as such*. God did not simply make him from the dust of the ground, in the beginning, but breathed into him also a *portion of his own life*, and so constituted him a living soul.

"As such an *efflux from God*, still bound through every point of its separate existence with the ocean of light and love from which it proceeds, the human spirit everywhere challenges our *awful respect*. We are *bound to reverence it in all men*. Even an infant may claim in such view *the inmost homage* of our hearts, for it carries in its tiny life potentially the high and holy mystery of *self-acting intelligence*, in comparison with which the sun itself is a very small thing."—*Address*, p. 9.

Man, he thus represents, is, beyond any other form in which God exists, the proper object of our homage. We are under obligation to regard the human mind, wherever it exists, with religious veneration; and simply because it is an intelligence; and it is to be worshipped in ourselves, he expressly maintains, as much as in others. "Thus reverencing others, we are led," he says, "to exercise the same sentiment also towards ourselves." We have no knowledge, we have no conception, according to his theory, of a personal deity, except as he exists in men and other similar finite creatures who have intellect and will.

If the universe of objects and creatures is thus nothing else than God in finite forms, and if man is the highest and most divine of those forms, it is manifest that all the thoughts of men are God's thoughts, all their affections his affections, all their desires and volitions his desires and volitions, and all their acts his acts; and thence that they and all the other processes and phenomena of the universe are but operations and manifestations of his infinite nature. This is indicated in most of the passages we have already quoted, and is expressed again in the following, in which all the actions of men, and all the processes of nature, are represented as revelations of God and his will:—

"What we are required to reverence here, as before in the constitution of the outward world, is a divine revelation, an actual self-manifestation of God's glory and name; which in this case meets us, however, in the form of created intelligence and will, and not as before in the form simply of blind nature. This system of created intelligence and will, the life of man in its general or collective character, is itself the revelation we are bound to respect. And do you ask now, in what way this homage is exacted at our hands? The answer is plain:—Through the ethical constitution of society (itself God's work), as it starts in the Family, rises into the State, and completes itself at last in the glorious idea of the Church. . . . The worst of all heresies, as false to philosophy as it is to religion, is comprehended in the imagination that reason and will are the private property simply of those to whom they belong, by means of which they are called to transact the great work of truth and righteousness directly and immediately with God himself in an abstract and separate way. Such private judgment, and private will, may indeed pretend a more than usual regard for the authority

of God, as not enduring *the intervention of any other authority less absolute than his own*; but this is only to substitute in truth an *empty thought* for a *divine reality*. God's truth and God's will come not to men, not even through the *Bible itself*, in any such abstract and naked style; and so to be the object *at all of reverence or faith*, they must be apprehended as a *real revelation*, under the form of *life and spirit, in the actual structure of the human world*."—*Address*, pp. 10, 11.

Dr. Nevin holds accordingly that "inspiration itself forms no exception to this rule:" that the prophets and apostles were no more the medium of a revelation than all other individuals of their several ages were. They were simply "the birth and product of their own time, *the central organs of their generation*, in which *the inmost moving of its life comes to apprehension and utterance*. Their oracles belong to the true *universal life* of the world. They come *mediately* through *the organization of the religious life* as an existing whole at the time, and not by any means as abrupt meteors shot from the clouds."—P. 11. They were no more inspired, therefore, than Hesiod, Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, or their contemporaries; and their revelations are no more divine, nor of any more authority, than the codes are of the lawgivers, who founded the civil politics of the Greeks, the speculations of their philosophers, the religious doctrines of their priests, the fictions of their poets, the maxims of their moralists, and the narratives of their historians. All the notions, all the judgments, all the beliefs, all the sentiments of men, stand in that respect on the same level. It is impossible, indeed, on Dr. N.'s theory, that God should make any more authoritative revelation through one than he does through all others. He accordingly regards the history of the world as the history of God;—a vast series of thoughts, affections, volitions, acts, and processes, of which he is the sole author and subject. Thus he says:—

"The revelation of God, under the form now in view, is not something at once finished and complete from the beginning. On the contrary, it is accomplished in the way of *history*. In this respect the world of mind differs from the world of mere nature. This last has no history, in the true sense of the term, except as we may

choose to conceive of a vast cosmogony going before its present state, and making room for it in the way affirmed by geologists. Humanity, on the other hand, is plainly a *process* by which one generation is required continually to carry forward the sense of another. History becomes thus, in a deep sense, nothing less than a *divine anthropogony*, by which the *universal life of man*, in the form of reason and will, is moving forward always to its grand completion. It becomes plain at once, in this way, what sort of homage and respect it is entitled to claim at our hands. Shall we own God's presence in *nature*, and take it by faith for the sure guarantee of order, reason, and law, even in the whirlwind and earthquake; and shall we, then, turn round and say of *history*, the revelation of *spirit*, in which that other revelation finds its whole sense and end, it is chaos, without form and void! . . . Must we see God in the stars, must we hear him in the storm and in the breeze, must we converse with him through the flowers of the field, and yet have no power to perceive his stately goings in the far more awful sanctuary of the *human spirit*, carried forward by successive generations towards its proper consummation! There is blasphemy in the very thought. History is no chaos. . . . We may find much here to bewilder and confound our thoughts. . . . But, notwithstanding this, we are bound to believe that history, as a whole, is *divinely rational*, and that it embodies in itself, under such views, the power of a *moral authority*, which reason and piety alike require all men to respect. It is not possible to have any sense of the *organic constitution* of the world [that is, its pantheism], by which the *general reason and will* become the medium of *divine revelation* for individual men, without being made to feel, to the same extent, the intimate and necessary connexion of this *general life with itself*, in the flow of time . . . Not to have faith in history, and not to reverence it as a *true revelation of God's mind and will*, is simply to be without true faith and reverence towards *God himself*."—*Address*, pp. 12, 13.

The whole series of thoughts, affections, and acts in the intellectual, and of events in the physical, world, are thus acts and processes of the divine nature. God is the only existence; He is the only agent; He is the universe itself. Material organisms and intelligent creatures are only finite forms into which he distributes himself.

We might point out other particulars in which Dr. Nevin unfolds this pantheistic system; but these sufficiently show that his theory of God, of men, and of the universe, is, in all its great features, nothing else than that of Schelling.

What a combination of falsehood, of senselessness, and of impiety! It implies the infinite solecism of a reduction of the self-existent and illimitable to the dimensions and level of creatures; and of an exaltation of creatures to the dimensions and level of the self-existent and illimitable! It involves the awful blasphemy of exhibiting God as an apostate from righteousness; the perpetrator of all the evil that exists; and the subject of the condemnation and punishment which he inflicts on his creatures. It is, accordingly, wholly destructive of Christianity. There can be no redemption, on this scheme, for there are no creatures to be redeemed. A redemption were a redemption of God, and from himself, which is an infinite solecism. There can be no redemption, for there is no sin. All the acts of finite intelligences are the acts of God existing in these forms; and so far from being in any measure or instance *sinful*, they are "a revelation of his will," which these very intelligences are bound to respect and honor as the will of infinite reason and right. They are not the objects, therefore, of his disapproval. To suppose him to regard them with displeasure, is to suppose him to have precisely opposite judgments and affections respecting them, and charge him with immeasurable inconsistency and self-contradiction. As, then, there can be no disapprobation, and thence no condemnation, there can be no obnoxiousness to punishment, and thence no expiation, no pardon, and no redemption; and the whole idea of a mediation, a deliverance of offenders from the dominion and curse of sin, and a restoration to the image and favor of God, becomes a revolting farce! Yet this horrid complication of senselessness and blasphemy is Dr. Nevin's favorite theory, and lies at the foundation of the whole of his peculiar notions of Christianity and the church.

We now proceed to the views entertained by Dr. Nevin and his party of Christ and the church, and the connexion which subsists between them. Their theory on this subject is but a new or second pantheism commensurate with the church, which exhibits Christ's nature and life as transferred into or reproduced in every one who is initiated into the church by baptism, and as the power that reigns in him and gives the cast to his religious character. This is, indeed, on their own principles, a total self-contradiction and impossibility. Their

theory of the Absolute does not contemplate God as existing in a trinity of persons. Instead, they hold that God had no personality until he unfolded himself in the form of finite intelligences; and the personalities which he thus assumed, were not those of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but of the finite intelligences into which he distributed himself. There is, therefore, no trinity of persons in the Deity, and no possibility of a work of redemption by a Divine Mediator and Sanctifier, like the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are distinguished as persons from the Father, and differ wholly in nature and sphere from men who are the subjects of redemption. Schelling, Schleiermacher, and other German pantheists, accordingly, and their followers in this country, maintain that the trinity of the Godhead, instead of a threefold personality, is nothing more than a triform manifestation of himself. As, then, on this theory, there is no personality in the Deity, except as he personifies himself in finite intelligences, and no divine nature distinct from the Absolute to become incarnate in man, it is manifest that the incarnation of the Divine Mediator can be nothing more than the incarnation of the Absolute; that is, the evolution of himself in the man Christ Jesus, in precisely the same way as he personifies himself, or takes the human form, in every other individual of our race; with this difference, which lies wholly, not in the nature, but in the agency of Christ—that the moral modes in which he unfolds himself, or acts in him, are all in harmony with his will as the Absolute, or the law he has imposed on men; while, in all other human persons, he violates that law. To suppose that there was any higher or different incarnation, would be to suppose that there was a double inhabitation and evolution of the Deity in him; that after the Absolute had become finite in him in the form of man, in the mode in which he does in all other human persons, he then again became finite, or assumed a personal form in him, so as to constitute a double incarnation, or enwrap one finite personality in another, which is altogether inexplicable and self-contradictory. Many of the advocates of this system, accordingly, such as the disciples of Swedenborg and Dr. Bushnell and his party, deny that Christ had a human intellect, in distinction from the Logos, who was united to his human nature.

And this is the view, we take it, that is entertained by the gentlemen of the *Mercersburg Review*. They speak of Christ as the—

“One universal man, in whom the whole *idea of humanity* is fully and concretely *realized*; one in whom the real and the ideal, the natural and supernatural, the human and divine, join in everlasting harmony. And when,” they ask, “has such a universal man ever appeared, if not in the person of him who once slumbered as a babe in the manger at Bethlehem?”—*Mercersburg Review*, 1852, p. 74.

If the whole idea of humanity is thus fully and concretely realized in Christ, there of course is nothing in him but what properly belongs to humanity: that is to God, on this theory, when he unfolds himself in a finite form in one of our race, who acts in perfect conformity to the law which he imposes on men. They maintain, accordingly, that humanity in Christ, that is, God in human form in him, was nothing more than humanity, as it originally existed in Adam anterior to his fall.

“In Christ, the second Adam, humanity re-appears in that *union with God*, which had been lost in the first. In him we look for the example of *true spiritual life*, both as to its *inward constitution* and its outward *form*. In him the life is given in its principle as purely *divine*, and not an extract, or an accident of *fallen humanity* in the laws of its action in man, and in the form of its exercises and its fruits.”—*Mer. Rev.*, 1852, p. 148.

The incarnation in Christ, and all other men, then, is identically the same; the only difference between humanity in him and all others of the race since the fall, is, that God enshrined in him *acts consistently with himself, or conformably to his own law*; while, in all fallen men, he violates that law, or separates from and assumes an antagonism to himself; and thence, redemption consists in the relinquishment of that independence and antagonism, and return to harmony with himself. And this is identically the theory of Schelling.

“He attempts, in his philosophy of revelation, to deduce scientifically the whole doctrine of the Bible, concerning the fall of man, and his redemption by Christ. In this portion of his philosophy, the doctrine of the trinity is explained on the principle of the three

divine potencies [that is, modes of agency] which have been so often employed ; the fall of man is interpreted as being *the disuniting of the human will as the type, from the Divine will as the anti-type* ; while the doctrine of *redemption* is viewed as *the reunion of that will to God*. The first Adam, *the original type of humanity, separated from God*, and acted during the ages of this resisted evil as the God of this world, striving after an *independent* and extra-divine existence. The second Adam, on the other hand, *the type of the new creation*, exhibited the *return of man to a perfect union with the Divine nature*.

"On this principle is explained the whole religious history of the world, that history showing, like everything else, three different phases. From the fall of man to the coming of Christ, the human consciousness was given up to the influence of the power of nature, being separated from God and devoted to sense. [That is, each one, being in fact divine, having a complete personality in himself, assumed that he was himself a real independent God, irrespective of all others ; and refused to acknowledge his relation to the Absolute ; and why, on this theory, should he not ? He ascribed a deity in like manner to other distinguished individuals of the human race, and to the great elements of nature.] Hence, the rise of polytheism, and the existence of heathen mythology generally. Gradually, the *identity of these powers with God* began to break in upon the mind, and gave the first notion of monotheism, which was completed in Christ the God-man. Christ represented the complete *reunion of man to God* ; the return of *the finite revolted will to the infinite* ; a return which is shadowed forth by his *perfect obedience*."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, p. 451.

The renovation and redemption of men must consist, accordingly, in a change of the mode in which God acts in them, so that their wills and actions conform to his law ; or in a reproduction in them of precisely such a state of humanity as originally existed in Adam, and now exists in Christ ; and is manifested by "the return in them" of the finite will to the infinite. This is the representation which Dr. Nevin gives of it.

"Man is formed to be free. It lies in the very conception of intelligence, that it should be *a law to itself*, and not obey blindly and mechanically a power foreign to its own nature. Self-consciousness, *the image of God in man*, completes itself in activity. Truth becomes fully actual in the world only when it passes into the

form of freedom; which may be said, for this reason, to constitute the crown and glory of the whole creation." . . . "Few, however, have any right conceptions of freedom. It is taken, for the most part, to consist in the mere outward liberty by which men are allowed to use their lives according to their own will, without constraint or coercion from abroad. . . . But this conception severs the will from the law; makes them to stand altogether out of each other, and so places the value of liberty at last in the supposed *independence* wholly of the first separately considered. . . .

"In full opposition to every fiction of this sort, the true idea of freedom meets us only where rights cease to be abstract, and merge themselves in the sense of society as a whole [which he holds is a revelation of God's will]; only when judgment and will lay aside their merely *private* character, and show themselves as universal as the law itself. Liberty is an ethical fact which stands just in this, that *the single will*, in virtue of *that* DIVINE AUTONOMY or self-motion which belongs to it by its creation [that is, the indwelling and all-actuating Deity], flows over the boundaries of *the individual life* in which it has its rise, and makes itself one with the pure ether of truth that surrounds it [that is, the revelation of God's will made in the race generally]—the glorious sea of light in which it is carried and borne."—*Address*, pp. 13, 14.

In other words, the emancipation of the individual from the bondage of evil, and elevation into that freedom which is the characteristic and prerogative of the redeemed, lies simply in the return of his finite will to a concurrence with the universal or infinite; that is, the Absolute, which unfolds itself in a finite personality in him, comes to act in harmony with the law which God has imposed on himself in his personality as man, and which he himself obeys. And this, according to the Mercersburg Reviewers, is precisely the peculiarity that distinguishes Christ from other men. They hold, therefore, that Christ himself presents a perfect exemplar of the redemption which he achieves in others. They say:—

"Now with a proper view of Christ's person, there is no possibility of separating the idea of redemption from a *personal Redeemer*. Here alone can it, in its complete personality, be reached. In the person of Christ only is *that life* lodged, which is our redemption. Here not only the redeeming power, but *the redemption itself* centres. . . . 'I am the resurrection and the life.' In me, not by me, as a

separate operation, the world, its whole process centring in *generic humanity*, is reconciled to God and by God. . . . In him *generic* fallen humanity is *already Christianized* and *redeemed*, and out of his person there can be no redemption whatever, and also no proper *humanity*. As the incarnation implies, *he* is the concrete God-man, and in this concretion, and nowhere else, rests the very conception of Christianity."—*Review*, 1852, note p. 487.

Christ himself thus, according to these writers, presents in his own person a perfect exemplification of the Christianization and redemption which he came to accomplish in others; and it consists simply in the fact that the Deity that is incarnized in him, lives and acts in perfect harmony with the Divine will, precisely, as the Deity incarnized in Adam and Eve, as is held by these writers, acted in them anterior to their fall.

This, then, must be accomplished, the theory would seem to require, by the reproduction simply, *through Christ's* mediatorial work or agency, in those who are the subjects of redemption, of *a humanity* in identically the same state, or of precisely the same kind, as the generic humanity, as the Mercersburg gentlemen denominate it, which is in Christ himself. Such, accordingly, appears to be the view given by them in some of their representations.

"God, who in the eternal Son became *immediately* united with humanity in the person of Christ, is united *mediately through* Christ with the persons of his disciples. In him the Divine power is joined immediately to personal humanity, and in them it becomes a personal *constituent* through his mediation. The facts in the one case form the decisive example of the immediate union of God and man in Christ; the facts in the other case form an equally clear example of the *mediated* union of God with his people *through* Christ. Now it is the constituted subordination of Divine power to the human will which forms to us the intelligible sign of single personality in Christ, and represents to us the reality of the manifestation of God in the flesh. Without this we could not understand that the Word was really made flesh. The Divine nature having now, in the person of the Son, assumed its connexion with humanity, and revealed the relation which it condescends to hold to the *personal agency of man*, the way is prepared to *extend* this relation, through the mediation of the person thus formed, to those who shall be heirs of salva-

tion. The way of producing this union of divine power with the people of God, is by the actual indwelling of Christ in them. Christ is formed in them; lives in them; dwells in them; and this is the language in which the Scriptures describe the application of divine power in the acts of the spiritual life. . . . Christ joins God and man in himself; then, with *his complex nature*, becomes *the life* of his people; doing in them, and *through* their free and personal agency, *what he did in his separate personal life as a manifestation of God in the flesh*. With God, then, united to the humanity in Christ, with the divine power in him subjected under certain conditions and in certain matters, to the human will; and then with Christ the first-born of every creature, *the first formed spiritual man*, the principle, the model, the embodied power of the new life of man, *so reproduced in his people*, so con corporate with them, as to bring forth in them and through them such works as *he first wrought in his separate person* without them; *we have the mysterious and adorable constitution of the new creation in Christ.*"—*Review*, 1852, pp. 150, 151. See also p. 289.

Some of these expressions thus seem to indicate that the redemption of the believer lies simply in such a union of God with, and development in his humanity, as exists in Christ; and that this union and development after the pattern of Christ's incarnation, is produced by means, or in consequence of his mediation. They perhaps admit, however, of a different construction, and other parts of the representation may be thought to imply that it takes place by the union of Christ himself, in his "complex nature," to their humanity, or transfusion into it along with, or substitution in it in place of the Absolute which was originally incarnized in it. Such seems to be the import of some expressions in the following and several similar passages.

"We must have in view not only an objective Christ but a living, ever-present, *subjective* Christ. Precisely this is the conception of the Kingly Christ, the fundamental mystery upon which the church rests. . . . As head of his body he takes part in an endless way in the fortunes and circumstances of his church; and in his creative power he is the all-determining, all-pervading central will in the whole organism—the principle of the Spirit in the church."—*Review*, 1852, p. 317.

The other, however, is in better accordance with their

pantheistic system, and is, we presume, their real theory. Thus they say:—

“An *actualization* is as necessary on the one hand to that Christ-life which is revealed in the incarnation, as the incarnation is on the other to its revelation. Of course this Christ-life *was* completely actualized in its revelation; yet not in the sense of having gone forth as a living power, or as having actualized itself by bringing into its own organism the whole world which had become regenerated by it. The very assumption of fallen humanity upon the part of the *Word* was, in *Christ's person, its redemption and regeneration*; for he assumed it, not to sin with it, but to redeem it, and in this very act is centred *the full redemptive power and efficacy of his person*. So we can say *in him* the redemption of the world is actualized as its fall was in Adam [that is, that which took place in the union of the divine and human in Christ, is precisely that in kind which is to take place in every one who is redeemed by him]; yet we do [not] mean by this that his personal life has gone forth into the world, and actually Christianized every element of its life [that is, we do not mean that he actually accomplished that union of the divine and human in men generally]; but only, that in the incarnation we find *the realized possibility* of this historical process [that is, we find an exact example of what is to be wrought in each individual who is redeemed], and the absolute necessity of its actualization, as a *life-power* in the world. . . . Referring Christianity to the person of Christ for its *distinctive* character *as life*, we find that from its very nature it must take up organically into itself and completely redeem *the life* of the world. This constitutes in its *idea* the very *type of the process*, the peculiar plasticity of its power. As the law of all growth is the development of a central point of evolution, in which the whole possible existence is contained, and the whole form prefigured, so Christianity, as historical and evolving itself from Christ's person, can never go out of or beyond that person as constituting its life-giving and formative ground. As humanity can never cease to be Adamic, so neither can Christianity cease to be Christly. If, then, Christianity thus receives its character from Christ's person, it must of necessity bear along *in its constitution his personal life*, and that personal life, from the very fact of the incarnation, must organically take up into itself the life of the world.”—*Review*, pp. 487, 488.

The import of this is, that precisely such a constitution in the union of the divine and human, and thence such a life

must be produced in those who are redeemed, as exist in and are characteristic of Christ in whom God is united to, or individualized in humanity in such a manner that all the actions which he exerts are in harmony with the will of the Absolute.

This reproduction in the members of the church of what they call "generic humanity," or humanity in that state in which it originally existed in Adam, is wrought, they represent, through the sacraments; or they are the media through which the power is infused or exerted, that restores the fallen nature to the state in which it first existed, and reappeared in Christ. Thus they say—

"It is the conception of the SACRAMENTS that meets us here. The sacraments which to the outward view are only emblematic acts of the church, are, according to their unseen substance, *creative and redeeming acts of the risen Christ*. It is not merely a holy thought, a divine idea which has enveloped itself in the sacraments; it is a PERSONAL WILL—not a representing, but a working will. It is the *all-organizing will of Christ*, which here reveals itself in its centrality. The sacrament is not merely a making visible, an explanation, a pledge of the grace; but while it is all this, it is at the same time the *real communication of the grace*—the communication of that alone by which a *life evolution* is possible. . . .

"For it is through these means of grace that Christ makes himself ever anew the *pre-requisite* of the life of the Spirit in the church; it is through the medium of these, not only that the Spirit *once* went forth from Christ—in which case Christ would have been merely the material instrument of the Spirit—but that the Spirit *ever anew* goes out from him as from his living source. If the *being or essence* of the Spirit is designated *action, evolution, process* [the doctrine of this pantheistic system, which denies a trinity of persons in the God-head, and regards the Holy Spirit as only a mode of agency], then it must be said that the sacraments and the word contain the *firm and enduring*, namely, *fulness of Christ*, out of which the Spirit draws. If the Spirit, in his divine presence in the church, is always bound to a *relative historical stage of the development* of the church consciousness, then the sacraments are the eternal source, the unconditional beginning of all development, as well in the present as in the future world."—*Review*, 1852, p. 318.

The supposed restoration of fallen humanity to the state in

which it originally existed in Adam and reappeared in Christ; or which is the same thing, the return of the Deity, which, according to this theory, is individualized in each human person, to the species of agency which he exercised in Adam anterior to the fall, and now exercises in Christ, is thus wrought through the medium of the sacraments. They are the instruments by which that great rectification which includes the whole substance of redemption is produced.

The system of these writers manifestly, thus far, is nothing else than the pantheism of Schelling. Though their views of Christ, the Spirit, and redemption, are concealed in a measure by their use in an unusual sense of terms and expressions which their readers may, perhaps, interpret as conveying much the same meaning as that with which they are employed in the Scriptures, yet when their statements and reasonings are analysed, it is abundantly clear that their real import is altogether pantheistic. But if, as they hold, humanity in each individual is but the Deity in a finite form, and the thoughts, affections, volitions, and acts of each individual, are the thoughts, affections, and acts of God in his personality; if redemption consists in the restoration of humanity in the individual to the state or relation to the Deity in which these writers maintain it originally existed in Adam and reappears in Christ; or in the return of the indwelling deity to an agency that is conformable to the divine law or will; and if, after that return or restoration, that will or law is the law of the individual's agency, as they hold it was in Adam before he fell, and is now in Christ, it follows, and these writers maintain, that the religious doctrines, the faith, the worship, and the moral practices, or in a word, all the actions of those who are the subjects of that restoration, are a *revelation* of God, and a manifestation of his *will*. It is a real Christian life, therefore, which they live, and constitutes a perfect exemplification of what Christianity is, precisely as they hold the life of Christ is an exemplification of his doctrines, laws, and spirit. But the faith, the worship, and the practice of the church, have, in different ages, varied immensely. In the third, fourth, fifth, and later centuries, doctrines were held, rites were observed, a worship was offered, and practices prevailed, that were wholly unknown to the Apostolic age, and that are now rejected by Protest-

ants as entirely inconsistent with the Christian system. The religion of the Protestant church is, in many most important particulars, in direct antagonism with the religion of the Romish church, and the religion of the Romish church is in equal, and a very similar antagonism with that of the Apostolic church. How is this extraordinary fact to be reconciled with the doctrine of these writers,—that, nevertheless, the belief and action of the church, in each age, are a revelation and actualization of God's will, and a perfect exponent of genuine Christianity itself, at that period?

This is the great problem, having its ground altogether in their pantheistic views of God and man, and wholly unknown to the Bible and to evangelical Protestantism, which Dr. Nevin and his party attempt to solve; and following in the train of Schleiermacher, Neander, and others whose systems are based on that of Schelling and Hegel, they employ for the purpose the theory of development.

This theory is founded on an assumed analogy between living organisms in the vegetable and animal world, and individuals, and communities of men. As there is something in the seed of a plant which determines its growth and evolution in a particular manner, or is the cause that it shoots up a trunk of a specific form, sends out branches of a certain shape, puts forth leaves of a particular figure and hue, and unfolds in flowers and fruit that are peculiar to itself; in a word, that it has a structure throughout, that distinguishes it from all others, and that is of the type that is characteristic of all the other individuals of its species; so they hold that Christianity, the principle of Christian life, or that rectifying energy, whatever it may be, which, according to them, is infused into each individual at his baptism, and into the church as a community by the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; is a determinative constitutional nature, element, or power in each individual and in the church as a body, that generates and unfolds itself in their beliefs, their forms of worship, and their religious discipline and practice, and is the ground and cause of their existence and nature, their growth, and the variations which take place in them from time to time. The doctrines, therefore, the worship, and the practice both of individuals, and of the church as a body, in every age, they maintain, are so many forms of Chris-

tianity itself, at those periods, and manifestations of its true nature; as real revelations, and as perfect exponents of it in its genuine and only being at those epochs, as the New Testament in its doctrinal and preceptive teachings is, of what it was at its institution by the Redeemer. The religion of the church, indeed, at each stage of its progress, is, they assert, Christianity itself actualized at that stage of its evolution, and the religion of the church through its several ages, is, accordingly, what they denominate historical Christianity, or Christianity actualized in history. The following passages present the principal features of this theory, as it is held by Professor Schaf:—

“The main point is to set in proper light the idea of *organic development*; since this forms the key to the understanding of history. . . . This conception, itself, is differently held by different persons, and I also claim the right of deviating in several points from Hegel, Schleiermacher, Neander, &c. . . . ‘Subjective Christianity, or the life of the God-man in the church, is a process, a development, which begins small, and grows always larger, till it comes, at last, to full manhood in Christ; that is, till the believing human world may have appropriated to itself, both outwardly and inwardly, the entire fulness of objective Christianity, or the life of Christ.’ ‘We conceive of historical movement as an ever increasing stream . . . that rolls itself forward according to divine laws, to empty itself finally in the ocean of eternity. We maintain, consequently, that the Spirit of Christ himself, uninterruptedly present in the church, is the chief factor in history, to whose power all human factors, which are also to be acknowledged in their places, must be regarded as subordinate; and that *nothing which has once come to be of true historical weight*, can be absolutely neglected or made to become null, but *must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element in the subsequent part of the process.*’ . . .

“What, then, are we to understand by *organic or regular development* in itself considered? And how is the general idea to be applied to the history of the church?

“The lowest kind of process, which, indeed, can be only improperly so termed, is the mechanical motion of the heavenly bodies, which revolve around their sun, obeying unconsciously the immanent law of their constitution. This motion, however, always returning into itself, is not yet life, but at best an analogy only of life. The proper *genesis* first appears in the sphere of organic nature

in the life of the *plant*. The plant is possessed of a real life ; and is the subject, thus, of a development that begins with the seed, forms itself from this into root, stem, branch, leaf, and blossom, and becomes complete in its fruit. Here we have progress constantly from the lower to the higher ; but still *nothing is revealed that was not contained potentially in the germ*. The last result, accordingly, of the vegetable development, the fruit, comprises in itself, again, new seed ; so that the end returns always with new wealth to the beginning.

"A still higher form of life is the animal ; at the head of which, though of a specifically different order of existence, stands man, so far as his earthly nature is concerned. Man exists first as an embryo, and as such is said to pass as it were cursorily in his conformation, through all the lower stages of the animal life. After his birth, he makes the course of his childhood, boyhood, youth, manhood, and old age. In all these stages he is *man*, and preserves thus in his development *the unity of his nature*, but in all at the same time he is again different, inasmuch as his general nature takes continually a *more definite form*, and reveals itself in a higher and more perfect way. Still, even the highest stage, the life of the old man, is but the full evolution of the life that was *originally present in the child*. This development we denominate regular and organic, *since it follows of necessity an inward life force*, proceeds with equal steady order, and continues always *true to the original nature* of the man, till in the end it has brought the whole fulness of it into view.

"Parallel precisely with the bodily life of man, is the life also of his spirit. For soul and body are by Divine constitution most intimately bound together, and what God has thus joined, man has no right to put asunder. Both parts of his being develop themselves hand in hand together. Man comes not into the world a scholar, an artist, or the possessor of a moral or religious character. He carries within him indeed the *capacity* for life in such form ; but this only in the way of *germ*, that must yet be developed, by impulse from within and the influence of proper conditions without, as the plant grows through the action of air, sunshine, and rain. Here we have in full again what we have just noticed in the case of his animal life. Spiritual growth or development is likewise a process of annihilation, preservation, and exaltation ; in which it comes, in the end, to a complete explication only of what was *present* by implication at the start. *This must be affirmed even of the development of the life of religion itself.* . . . What holds of the individual, must hold also of humanity as a whole, since this is simply the organic totality of all single men. So precisely as the single Christian

does not become complete at a stroke, but only by degrees, the church, as the complex of all Christians, must admit and require too a gradual development. Christ himself, as the head of the church, submitted to the law of a genesis in time, and grew from infancy up to manhood. . . . How then shall the church, which repeats and contains the earthly life of Christ, form an exception to this law of development?

"We present now the particular characteristics of this development of the kingdom of God, as they disclose themselves in a thorough study of history.

"This development of the church [that is, of Christianity] is partly *external* and partly *internal*. . . . The development of the church [that is, of Christianity] is organic. It is no mechanical accumulation of events, and no result simply of foreign influences. Certain outward conditions are indeed required for it, as the plant needs air, moisture, and light, in order to grow. But still the impelling force in the process, is the *inmost life of the church herself*. Christianity is a new creation that unfolds itself continually more and more from within, and *extends itself* by the necessity of its own nature. It takes up, it is true, foreign material also in the process; but changes it at once into its own spirit, and assimilates it to its own nature, as the body converts the food required for its growth into flesh and blood, marrow and bone. The church [that is, Christianity] accordingly in this development remains true always to her own nature, and *reveals only what it contained in embryo* from the start."—*Schaf's Church Hist. or Vindication of the Idea of Hist. Development*, pp. 80–91.

From Professor Schaf's presenting this theory in some of these passages as a theory of the *church* instead of Christianity, the reader might perhaps suppose he designs simply to exhibit the church as a mere society, in contradistinction from its faith, worship, and life, as the subject of this development. That, however, is not his meaning, as is seen from the representation near the commencement of the quotation, that it is "Christianity" itself, that is the subject of the "process" which he describes; and from the consideration that the object of the theory is to account for the variations that have arisen in the doctrinal belief, the worship and the practice of the church in the different ages of its progress, consistently with the theory held by the Mercersburg writers, that the faith, worship, and religious life generally of the church, are

themselves the very substance of Christianity, and the whole of its being at the several stages of its existence. "We distinguish," he says, "between truth as *objectively* present in Christ and in the Scriptures, and truth as *subjectively* present in the consciousness of the church, and say, CHRISTIANITY, in itself and *objectively* considered, is *complete in Christ*, in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; as also *in his word*, which is exhibited in the holy Scriptures of the New Testament, in a pure, original, perfect, and absolutely *normative* form for all times. *Subjective Christianity*, on the contrary, is the life of the God-man in his church, is a *process, a development*, which begins small and grows always larger till it comes at last to full manhood in Christ."—P. 81. It is Christianity, accordingly, in this relation, not the church in distinction from its doctrines, worship, and religious life, that is the subject of his theory of development; and he represents that Christianity at its commencement in individuals and in the church as a society and succession of persons, is to Christianity *developed* at the different stages of its history, what a seed is to the plant that springs from it at the different stages of its evolution in the stalk, the branches, the leaves, the blossoms, and the fruit: and what a child is at its birth to what it is as it advances to boyhood, youth, manhood, and old age: that through all the modifications which it assumes, it continues "*true to its original nature*," and evolves nothing but what "*was originally present*" in it, and that everything of importance that is unfolded by it, "*must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element in the subsequent part of the process.*"

This is the theory also of Dr. Nevin and his coadjutors of the Mercersburg Review. Dr. N. says in his last article on Cyprian:

"The fact now must be admitted, and boldly looked in the face. *Early Christianity* was in its *constitutional elements*, not Protestantism, but *Catholicism*. Then there are but two general ways of vindicating the Reformation. We must either make all previous Christianity, back to the time of the apostles, a Satanic apostasy and delusion, and say that the church took a new start in the sixteenth century, as original as that of the day of Pentecost, and a

good deal more safe and sure; which is to give up historical Christianity altogether, and so, if we understand it, the whole conception of a supernatural, holy, and apostolic church. Or else we must resort to the theory of *historical development*, by which *the Catholic form of the church* shall be regarded as the natural and legitimate course of its history [that is, of Christianity], onward to the time of the Reformation; and the state of things since be taken as a more advanced stage of that same previous life, struggling forward to a still higher and far more glorious consummation in time to come. To reject both of these solutions, and to quarrel only with the facts that imperiously require either one or the other as the only escape from the argument in favor of the church of Rome, may well be pronounced *obscurantism* of the first order.

"We, of course, reject in full the *unhistorical theory*, and one object we have had in view always, has been to expose its *most insane and most perfectly untenable character*. It is, at least, but a decent name for infidelity. Religion built on any such foundation as this, rests only on the sand or wind. We are shut up then, of course, so far as we have any faith in Protestantism, to the theory of *historical development* as the only possible way of setting it in living union with the Divine fact of early Christianity."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 561, 562.

No more specific and emphatic language could have been employed by Dr. Nevin to express his assent to the theory of historical development. He not only adopts and maintains it, but he holds that it is the only ground on which it can rationally be believed that Christianity has now any existence. We are reduced to the alternative, he represents, of accepting it, and building all our religion on it, or of plunging at once into the rayless abyss of infidelity. It is Christianity itself, let it be remembered, not the church in distinction from it, which he exhibits as the subject of this historical development, and the *Catholic* form of the church as the natural legitimate and actual channel through which, he holds, it came down to the time of the Reformation.

Such are their doctrines of God and man, of Christ and redemption, and of Christianity and development. We have now, therefore, our readers will perceive, nothing more to do to verify our statement that, in the German Reformed church, a combination of persons has risen "who openly favor the doctrines of Romanism, exalt the authority of tra-

dition above the Scriptures, and rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart, and on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings ;" but simply to show that Dr. Nevin and his co-laborers in the *Mercersburg Review*, teach that what they call the doctrines of the Catholic church, or "historical Christianity," are "the doctrines of Romanism," and that among them they place the doctrine of tradition as of higher authority than the Scriptures, baptismal regeneration, eucharistic expiation, and the intercession of saints ; as, according to their theory of developed and historical Christianity, if those doctrines were held by the Catholic or Nicene and the Roman churches, they were "genuine" "constitutional elements" of "Christianity," at its original institution ; and have continued such in all the modifications it has undergone ; and Christianity, in developing them, has remained "true always to her own nature, and revealed only what it contained in embryo from the start," and "must ever" continue to "incorporate in itself," as an abiding element in the part of the process of development through which it is yet to pass ; and, consequently, it is as obligatory on the church now to receive them, as it is to receive and maintain any other truths of the Christian system.

We shall prove, then, that they favor the doctrines of Romanism, in the first place, by adducing passages in which they represent the Christianity of the fourth and fifth centuries, as eminently Romanistic.

"The Christianity of the fourth and fifth centuries was more Roman Catholic a great deal than Protestant. The best piety of this period, as it meets us in such saints as Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, is fairly *steeped* in what would be counted by the common Puritanism of the present time, rank, heathenish superstition. . . . We thought it was a matter conceded and granted on all hands, that not only the prelatical system, but *all sorts of Romanizing tendencies* besides, were in *full play* as early as the fourth century. . . . Puritanism, we thought, had settled it as a fixed maxim, that the seeds of Popery were not only *sown*, but actively *sprouting and bearing most ugly fruit on all sides*, in the fourth and fifth centuries."—*Review*, 1852, p. 6.

"The Puseyites, and the high church party in general, have been

disposed to build the authority of their system very much on the Nicene period of ecclesiastical antiquity; taking it for granted, that while it exhibits, with unmistakable clearness, all the traces of their theory as distinguished from every less churchly scheme, it may be regarded as standing equally clear from *the abuses of Romanism*, as these come into view along with *the growth of the Papacy in later times*. On the other side, however, it has been well and ably shown that there is no room for this last distinction, in any such pretended form. In particular, the work entitled 'Ancient Christianity,' . . . is devoted to the object of proving that this is a most perfect mistake, . . . and that, in truth, what are usually considered *the worst abuses of Romanism*, were already fully at work in this period; nay, that in many respects, *the form under which they then appeared* was decidedly *worse altogether* than that which they carried subsequently in the middle ages. . . . The evidence is absolutely overwhelming that the Nicene church was, in *all essential points*, of *one mind and character with the Papal church of later times*, and that where any difference is to be found, it was for the most part not in favor of the first, but against it, and in favor of the last."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 8–9.

"It is simply ridiculous, then, to make any question about *the reigning state* of the church in the fourth and fifth centuries, as related to *Romanism and Popery*. Our representation has not been a whit too strong for the actual truth of the case, but may be considered as falling short of this altogether. It is the merest romance, when such a man as Bishop Wilson, or any other evangelical Protestant of the present day, allows himself to dream that such men as Ambrose and Augustine were orthodox, and pious after his own fashion . . . and that they were, in a great measure, free from *the ideas which afterwards took full possession of the church*, under what is called *the Roman apostasy*. Every imagination of this sort is a perfect illusion. These fathers, and along with them *the entire church of their time*, were, in *all material respects*, fully committed to the later Roman system; and at some points, indeed, stood farther off from evangelical Protestantism, than *the full grown Popery of the eleventh and twelfth centuries*. Let this truth, then, be known and kept in mind. . . . *Nicene Christianity*, the system which the fourth century inherited from the third, and handed forward to the fifth, was not *Protestantism*, much less *Puritanism*; bore no resemblance to this whatever; but, in *all essential principles and characteristics*, was nothing more nor less than *ROMANISM ITSELF*."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 13–14.

As then, on their theory of historical Christianity, all the doctrines, rites of worship, and religious practices of the church of that period, were "organic" and "constitutional elements" of "Christianity" itself, and constituted the whole of its substance and being at that epoch; and as Christianity, according to their doctrine, always continues "true to its original nature," never developes anything but what was "originally present" in it, and whatever is unfolded by it, "must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element in the subsequent part of the process," through which it passes;—they formally and emphatically exhibit these elements of "Romanism," as constituents of Christianity itself at the present time; the very gist and substance of its being; and indicate it as the duty, therefore, of the church now to receive them as they are held at the present time in the Catholic church. No representation to this effect could be stronger or more emphatic. They maintain that to hold any other view, is to give up Christianity itself; that to reject the system of the Nicene church that continued to be the chief element of the Catholic faith and worship through the middle ages, and that still subsists in the Romish church, and forms the very substance of its religion, is, in fact, to make the religion of the church the religion of Satan, instead of the religion of Christ. They say—

"Granting then, as all who know anything of church history must, that Protestantism is not the restoration strictly of early (post-apostolical) Christianity, but this ran naturally rather first into the Nicene system, and then through that again into the later Roman Catholic system, how is the cause of the Reformation to be vindicated as just and right? What view shall we take of this disagreement, which shall not compromise the credit of Protestantism, but allow us to regard it still as worthy of our confidence and trust?

"Shall we cut the whole matter short, by casting off entirely the authority of the post-apostolical church from the second century down to the sixteenth, and by *throwing ourselves exclusively on the New Testament*, as a sufficient warrant for the modern system, not only without antiquity, but against it also, to any extent that the case may require? This is the ground taken by Puritanism. Its theory is, that Protestantism stands in *no organic historical connexion with the life of the Catholic church*, as we find it before the Refor-

mation; that the relation between the two was one of simple contradiction; that the old church was one of *entire apostasy from the Christianity of the New Testament*; and that this was reproduced in the sixteenth century, as an absolutely new creation, directly from its own original fountain and source. The assumption is, that the church, at an early period, fell away from its primitive purity, and came under the power of a strange and dreadful apostasy, which completed itself finally in the Papacy, and all the abominations usually charged upon the church of Rome. . . . So this Puritan theory, to be fully true to itself, is willing in the end to give up *all* post-apostolical antiquity. It is enough for it to be certain that the pattern of Protestantism is found in the New Testament. Grant that a different order of religion is found to be at work immediately afterwards, in the ancient church, to what does the fact amount in the face of this original rule, which the world can now interpret for itself? So far as any such difference goes, we have only to set it down from the first for an apostasy, the coming in of that grand catastrophe which afterwards turned the church into a synagogue of hell. Protestantism sets the whole process aside, overleaps the entire interval between the sixteenth century and the first, abjures antiquity clear back to the beginning, and claims to be a new and fresh copy simply of what Christianity was in the days of the Apostles.

"Altogether thus this Puritan theory runs directly towards infidelity. . . . On this account it is that we have denounced it as secretly the foe of Protestantism. We say most deliberately that a Christianity which is *not historical*, not the continuation organically of the proper life of the church as it existed from the beginning, but which abjures all connexion with this life as something false, and sets itself in contradiction to it as a totally new and different existence, can have no right whatever to challenge our faith as being the same supernatural fact that is set before us by the article of the church in the ancient creed. It seeks to turn that fact into a wholesale lie, by making such supposition the only alternative to its own truth. No defence of Protestantism in this form can stand. To make the Reformation a mere rebellion, a radical revolution, a violent breaking away from the whole authority of the past, is to give it a purely human, or rather an actually *diabolical*, character. It comes then just to this, that either the rebellion was diabolical, or else the ancient church back to the second century was the work of the *Devil*, and not *Christ's work*."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 22–25.

To reject the doctrines of Romanism, which were held by the church generally from the fourth century down through

the dark ages to the Reformation, and are still held in the Catholic communion, and regard them as an apostasy, is thus, according to the *Review*, to give up Christianity itself. It is worse: it is to make it "the work of the Devil." The mere fact that the antagonistic system held by Protestants is taught in the New Testament, is no reason whatever, these writers represent, for regarding it as the genuine Christianity of Christ. To possess that character and have any title to our faith, it must be an "*historical Christianity*;" it must have come down to us through the Catholic church; and it must have been developed into the Romish doctrines that were held in the Nicene age, that finally ran "into the later Roman Catholic system," and that are now the great constituents of the religion of the Papacy. And this certainly is indisputable on their pantheistic theory. If, as they hold, God is the only agent and the only existence in the universe; if men are only forms in whom he assumes a finite shape, becomes a personality, and individualizes himself; if "humanity" in every individual who belongs to the church, is restored by the sacrament of baptism and the eucharist to that state in which they hold it originally existed in Adam, and re-appeared in Christ; if the indwelling deity in all such acts uniformly in harmony with the law imposed on mankind; and finally if what is thus asserted of individuals is equally true of the whole church considered as a body, and if, as these writers maintain, the whole action of the church at any period of its existence, is a revelation of God and his will as perfect and as authoritative as the revelation made through Christ himself and the apostles while on earth, and recorded in the New Testament originally was—then unquestionably the doctrines and worship of the Nicene church, the Romish church of the middle ages, and the Papal church of the sixteenth and the present century, must be regarded as the genuine doctrines of the Christian system, and as obligatory on the church now, as Christianity itself is. There is no escape from this conclusion. Had Dr. Nevin and his associates filled the pages of their *Review* with specific professions of their faith in the doctrines of Romanism, and written a thousand volumes, to testify their conviction that there is no alternative but to receive them, or plunge into infidelity, they could not have given more

unanswerable proofs that on their system they are inseparable elements and the very substance itself of Christianity;—they would not have debarred themselves more absolutely from the denial that that is, on their theory, their character. Is not this “favoring the doctrines of Romanism?” Were they ever more emphatically endorsed; did they ever receive a more unconditional eulogy from Romanists themselves?

We shall prove that they favor the doctrines of Romanism, in the second place, by passages in which they expressly enumerate and specify them, as the doctrines of the Nicene church, which they represent as “organic” “constitutional” and “abiding” elements of Christianity. Thus they say—

“‘You tell us,’—exclaims some evangelical inquisitor—‘that Christianity as it stood in the fourth century and in the first part of the fifth, was something very different from modern Protestantism, and that it bore in truth a very near resemblance in *all material points to the later religion of the Roman Church.*’ That, sir, is what we have said. . . . ‘You go so far as to add, that were the fathers who then lived to return to the world in our time, they would find themselves more at home in the Papal than in the Protestant communion.’ We have not the least doubt of it. . . . ‘You hold that those fathers . . . knew nothing of the view which makes the Bible and private judgment the principle of Christianity, and the only source and rule of faith, acknowledged the central dignity of the bishop of Rome, believed baptismal regeneration, the mystery of the real presence, purgatory and prayers for the dead, venerated relics, had full faith in the continuation of miracles, and glorified celibacy, voluntary poverty, and the monastic life, as at once honorable to religion, and eminently suited to promote the spiritual welfare of men.’ Certainly, sir, we do hold all this.”—*Review*, 1852, pp. 2, 3.

“It is agreed all round that *the prelatical and pontifical system* was in full force in this period, that *the sacraments were regarded as supernatural mysteries, that purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the worship of the saints, were part and parcel of the reigning faith, that celibacy and monasticism were held in the highest honor, that an unbounded veneration for relics everywhere prevailed, and that miracles were received on all sides as events by no means uncommon or incredible in the church.*”—*Review*, 1852, p. 4.

“The Nicene Christianity bore *no resemblance whatever* to Protestantism. It carried in it *all the principles of Romanism*; so

that this is to be considered in many respects an improvement on the older system, a regulation and correction of its abuses, and not by any means the bringing in of something always progressively worse. The model saint of the period is presented to us in the person of Saint Antony, the patriarch of Monks. *Asceticism is made to be the highest style of piety. The merit of celibacy, the glorification of virginity, veneration for relics, all sorts of miracles, the idea of purgatory, the worship of saints, prayers for the dead, submission to the authority of the church, and faith in the sacraments as truly supernatural mysteries, come everywhere into view as the universal staple of religious thought.*"—*Review*, p. 13.

Here is thus an express specification of the main doctrines of Romanism, as the great constituents of that Nicene faith, which they maintain was the genuine and only Christianity of that age, has continued to form the very soul and substance of all true Christianity at every subsequent period, and must ever remain its most essential and vital element. To deny that they are the genuine, "organic" "constitutional" doctrines of Christianity;—to reject them as a gross perversion, as altogether false, as a monstrous apostasy, is, according to Dr. Nevin and his coadjutors, to give up Protestantism itself. It is by the recognition alone of these doctrines, as the substance of genuine Christianity, they maintain, that Protestantism can be brought into such a relation to the teachings of Christ and his apostles, as to be justified in appealing to them as authority for its doctrines; and by their recognition alone that it can be brought into such a connexion with the Christianity of the early ages, as to have any legitimate ground in respect to that for a claim to be considered as the Christianity of Christ. Thus Dr. Nevin says:—

"If Protestantism then is to be defended successfully, it can be neither on the ground that it is a repristination simply of early post-apostolical Christianity, nor on the ground that it is an absolute nullification of this ancient faith, leaping over it with a single bound to the age of the apostles.

"We are shut up thus to the idea of *historical development* as the only *possible way of escape* from the difficulty with which we are met in bringing the present here into comparison with the past. If the modern church must be *the same in substance* with the

ancient church, a *true continuation of its life* as this has been in the world by divine promise from the beginning, while it is perfectly plain at the same time that a wide difference holds between the two systems as to form, *the relation binding them together can only be one of living progress or growth*. No other will satisfy these opposite conditions. Growth implies unity in the midst of change. That precisely is what we are to understand by *historical development*.

"This is now felt by all who deserve to be considered of any authority in the sphere of church history. The whole progress of this science at the present time, under the new impulse which has been given to it by Neander and others, is making it more and more ridiculous to think of upholding the cause of the Reformation under any other view. It *must be one with the ancient church*, to have any *valid claim to its prerogatives and powers*; but this it can have only in the way of *historical growth*. Give that up, and *all is gone*. Without the idea of development the whole fact of Protestantism resolves itself into a lie."—Review, 1852, pp. 32, 35.

The question whether Protestantism is justifiable, and has a title to be regarded as the religion of Christ, or whether it is itself a consummate apostasy, an infinite "lie," thus depends altogether, according to Dr. Nevin, on the question whether these "doctrines of Romanism" are or are not the genuine doctrines of Christianity. If they are not, and if they are not in identically that relation in which the theory of historical development contemplates them, then "ALL IS GONE." "*The whole fact of Protestantism resolves itself into a LIE.*" And if they were organic elements, and the very essence of Christianity from the Nicene age down to the time of the Reformation, they, of course, are so now; as, according to the theory of development, Christianity always continues true to its "original nature;" and whatever is, at any time, unfolded by it, "must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element in the subsequent part of the process." They accordingly are now, in fact, the doctrines of the Romish church, and have as effective a claim on that ground to be regarded as the genuine doctrines of Christianity, as they had to be received as such in the Nicene and middle ages, because they were held by the church of those periods. The Romish church now extends her jurisdiction over a far vaster territory than at any time anterior to the Reform-

ation, and embraces in her bosom a much more numerous population. Why is not her voice then, at least, as authoritative now as it was in the dark ages, when she was immensely inferior in numbers and learning?

Besides, to deny that these doctrines are now the doctrines of Christianity and as obligatory as they ever were; to reject them as having become false; is to assign to them the identical character which is ascribed to them by Protestants and Puritans, and to make Protestantism itself, therefore, according to Dr. Nevin, dependent for its vindication and its truth on what he calls "*a fearful lie*." For, as he claims that there is not even a "*semblance*" of truth in Protestantism, unless these doctrines were the genuine doctrines of Christianity, from the fourth to the sixteenth century, if they are not now such doctrines, but have become wholly false, then plainly, Protestantism, according to him, is dependent altogether for its truth on a falsehood. Its whole basis is nothing else than what he calls a wholesale lie! What a beautiful method of vindicating the Reformation from the charge, to use Dr. Nevin's elegant vocabulary, of being "*the work of the devil, instead of Christ's work!*" What a brilliant result of the impassioned efforts he has made to save Protestantism from the ignominy with which it must otherwise be branded, of owing its descent to such a parentage! Do Dr. Nevin and his associates then, after all their efforts to invest Protestantism with a legitimate title to be regarded as a genuine form of Christianity, hold that it is altogether dependent for that character on a fearful lie? There is no escape from this conclusion, unless they regard the doctrines of Romanism as still the genuine doctrines of the Christian system, and as obligatory on the church as they hold they were at any other stage of its history. In what attitude could they have placed them that would have indicated in a more emphatic manner, that they regard them as still as true and as essential elements of Christianity, as they persuade themselves they were at the epoch of their development, and at the several stages of their history to the time of the Reformation? And is not this to favor the doctrines of Romanism?

Having thus sufficiently vindicated that part of our statement, we shall now, in the third place, verify our other alle-

gations, by adducing passages which show that they "exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures, and rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart, and on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings."

They "exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures." Tradition is the transmission of religious doctrines, rites, customs, or opinions, from one generation to another by teaching or example, independently of the Scriptures. When the term is used by metonymy for that which is thus conveyed from one age to another, it is then the doctrines, rites, opinions, and practices themselves that are transmitted from former ages, in contradistinction from the doctrines and teachings of the Scriptures. Taken in the first sense, to exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures, is to exhibit this traditional testimony or teaching, as having a higher title than the Scriptures to be received as a guide: taken in the other sense, it is to represent the *things* transmitted by tradition as having a higher claim to be received as essential elements of the Christian system than the things taught in the Bible. In both of these senses Dr. Nevin and his party exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures. For they maintain, as we have already shown, that there is no Christianity now, except what has come down through the channel of tradition; none but what is purely historical or has been developed in the life of the church, and handed forward from one age to another. They assert that that is the only possible way in which it can have come down to the present generation. They represent the Bible as wholly incapable either of transmitting it or of preserving it in itself; as having become to such an end completely obsolete; a mere dead letter. They maintain accordingly, without any disguise, that a "religion" that is "built on any such foundation as the mere testimony of the New Testament," and "rejects the theory of historical development,"—which is but another name for tradition—"rests only on the sand or wind;" and that to make the Scriptures the sole basis of a doctrinal system, is to plunge headlong into "infidelity."

"Shall we cut the whole matter short by casting off entirely the authority of the post-apostolical church from the second century

down to the sixteenth, and by throwing ourselves exclusively on THE NEW TESTAMENT, as a SUFFICIENT WARRANT for the modern system, not only without antiquity, but against it also, to any extent that the case may require? This is the ground taken by Puritanism. Its theory is, that Protestantism stands in no organic historical connexion with the life of the church as we find it before the Reformation . . . that the old church was an entire apostasy from the Christianity of the New Testament; and that this was reproduced in the sixteenth century, as an absolutely new creation, directly from its own original fountain and source.

"This theory," they say, "we have examined and found wanting:" . . . "It resolves all religion into private reason, by making this to be the only oracle of what is to be considered the divine sense of the Bible." . . . "This Puritan theory runs directly towards infidelity. . . . On this account it is that we have denounced it, as secretly the foe of Protestantism. We say most deliberately that a Christianity which is [founded exclusively in that manner on the Bible, and] not historical, not the continuation organically of the life of the church as it has existed from the beginning [that is, not traditional]—but which abjures all connexion with this life as something false—can have no right whatever to challenge our faith as being the same supernatural fact that is set before us by the article of the church in the ancient creed."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 22, 25.

"We must either make all previous Christianity back to the time of the apostles, a satanic apostasy and delusion, and say that the church took a new start in the sixteenth century, as original as that of the day of Pentecost . . . which is to give up historical [that is traditional] Christianity altogether; or else we must resort to the theory of historical development by which the Catholic form of the church shall be regarded as the natural and legitimate course of its history onward to the time of the Reformation. . . . We, of course, reject in full the unhistorical theory [which makes the Scriptures the only rule of faith, and the only absolute authority in religion]. It is at least but a decent name for infidelity. Religion built on any such foundation as this rests only on the sand or wind."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 561, 562.

The Scriptures thus, according to Dr. N. and his party, not only are not of supreme authority in matters of faith or of higher authority than tradition, but they are absolutely of no authority at all. To build on them exclusively of tradition is to reject Christianity, make its very existence impossible, and force us by an inevitable necessity, into the

utter unbelief of the infidel. The only medium through which Christianity can have come down to us is that of *tradition*; and tradition alone accordingly is of authority to determine us in regard to its nature. Is not this to exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures? Can any one ask a more ample demonstration of the truth of our statement?

They "rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart." Thus they represent the sacraments as the only channels of grace:—

"In the sphere of religion, in the holy sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, *the invisible and real grace of God is directly bound to external objects*, chosen because of an *inward concord and fitness*."—*Review*, 1852, p. 78.

"The sacraments which, to the outward view, are only emblematic acts of the church, are, according to their *unseen substance*, CREATIVE AND REDEEMING ACTS of the risen Christ. It is not merely a holy thought, a divine idea which has enveloped itself in the sacraments, it is a *personal WILL*—not a representing, but a *working will*. It is the all-organizing will of Christ, which here reveals itself in its centrality. The sacrament is not merely a making visible, an explanation, a pledge of the grace; but while it is all this, it is at the same time *the real communication of the grace—the communication of that by which alone a life evolution is possible*."—*Review*, 1852, p. 317.

They maintain that regeneration is wrought through the sacrament of baptism:—

"Baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *introduces the natural man into the communion of the triune God*."—*Review*, 1853, p. 319.

Dr. Nevin says of Cyprian:—

"Baptism is for him everywhere the *sacrament of regeneration, the mystery of the new birth, the real ground and foundation of spiritual life*. It never seems so much as to enter his mind that there can be any question made of this in the church. To doubt it would be, in his system, to doubt the supernaturalness of Christianity itself. . . . In the age of Cyprian no one questioned its power to

take away sin and to produce regeneration, who did not mean at the same time to question the whole fact of Christianity.

"Infant baptism in this view comes to its proper significance. Infants need the grace which the sacrament brings as much as others, and no age is to be shut out from the benefit of a salvation which God has provided for all."—*Review*, pp. 376, 378.

"It belongs to the idea of baptism, that this sacrament itself should include the grace of the Spirit, for remission of sins is granted to every one in baptism."—*Review*, 1852, p. 529.

They represent the eucharist as a sacrifice in which an expiation is made for sin :—

"The same real force Cyprian sees always in the mystery of the holy eucharist. It is for his faith an actual sacrament, and not merely an outward monument or sign. As it regards the mode of communication it offers with the body and blood of Christ, his language is indeed more general than precise ; but it is abundantly clear as to the fact. He says, ' Since then to eat of this bread is to live for ever, it is plain that those live who touch his body and receive the eucharist by right of communication, so on the other hand we must fear and pray lest any one, by being separated from Christ's body through prohibition, remain far from salvation.' . . . This makes the eucharist at once the communion of *the real flesh and blood of the Son of Man*, according to the awful mystery of his own words in the sixth chapter of John. Hence the stress we find laid on it as a *real viaticum*, a source of strength and fortification against evil for all great emergencies in the Christian life."

"Intimately connected with this idea of *the mystical presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the supper*, as the bread of life, is the *persuasion and belief* that the service carried in it *the force of a sacrifice or offering*. In whatever sense the mystery involves communion with Christ's body and blood, it is with his body, we know, as broken, and his blood as shed for the remission of sins. It is as *comprehending in them always the force of THE ATONEMENT wrought out by his bloody death*, that his flesh is thus meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed for the use of a dying world. That atonement in such view, is *no past transaction merely*, but a fact once for all, the power of a perennial indissoluble life, *always of force in the Saviour's person*. In such form it must of necessity go along with the sacramental exhibition of his flesh given for the life of the world. It will be then, *so far as the exhibition itself is a reality and no dream*, not as a remembered doctrine

merely, but in *its own actual virtue and power as a sacrifice always well pleasing to God.*"—*Review*, pp. 379, 380.

He quotes in confirmation of this from Cyprian :—

"For since Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is himself the high priest of God the Father, and has offered himself first as a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded to do this in remembrance of him; that priest, it is plain, truly officiates in Christ's place, who imitates what Christ did; and he then offers in the church a TRUE AND FULL SACRIFICE to God the Father, when he sets himself to offer according to what he sees to have been offered by Christ himself."—P. 380.

On this Dr. Nevin remarks :—

"The sacrament of the altar in this way becomes the centre of the universal Christian worship. All is a solemn λειτουργία revolving round the shekina of this mysterious presence. The unutterably glorious as well as awful REALITY which is here brought into view, is felt to underlie and bind together the whole new order of life to which it belongs, sending its pulsations like a mighty heart over the mystical body, and making it to be in truth the communion of saints. Hence those commemorations of the martyrs, which Cyprian made so much account of celebrating in this way. Hence the idea of a certain benefit to the dead through the power of this sacrifice performed on their account."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 380, 381.

Dr. Nevin and his associates thus exhibit the doctrine of expiation by the mass, and of baptismal regeneration, as among the most conspicuous and essential elements of that historical religion which they regard as the only Christianity that existed from the fourth to the sixteenth century; and on the legitimacy of which they affirm the truth of Protestantism and the Bible itself depends; and they as unhesitatingly adopt them and give them as complete a sanction as any of the other doctrines of that system.

Such are the proofs that they rely on sacraments for the atonement of sin, and the regeneration of the heart. Can any higher demonstration be asked of the truth of that part of our allegation? After having assigned to baptism and the eucharist the high office of producing regeneration and making "atonement" through a vast round of ages, is it

without a particle of evidence to be believed that they regard them as having ceased from those functions, and sunk to the rank of mere representatives and signs? They expressly deny that that is now their character. After having affirmed that "it belongs to the *idea* of baptism" that "it should include the grace of the Spirit," and declared that the eucharist *always* comprehends "the force of the atonement wrought out" by Christ's "bloody death;" that "atonement *must of necessity* go along with the sacramental exhibition of his flesh;" and that it *will* be there, so far as the exhibition itself is a reality and no dream, in its own actual virtue and power as a sacrifice; is it to be supposed that they now regard them as having lost those supernatural prerogatives, become wholly emptied of the "awful mysteries" with which they were originally charged, and fallen to the level of the mere commemorative or representative functions which modern Protestants and Puritans assign to them? No man can believe it.

And finally, they rely on "the intercession of saints for spiritual and temporal blessings." Thus Dr. Nevin says of a passage in Cyprian:

"Here we have a plain recognition of the thought, as one familiar on all sides, that *the prayers of the saints in heaven* are not without effect on earth, and that they are to be *desired and made account of accordingly* by those who are still in the body."—*Review*, 1852, p. 319.

"We have seen already, to some extent, how Cyprian's doctrine of *the church* gave character and form to his theological system at other points. Along with the idea of a *real Divine polity*, as truly present in the world as the Jewish Theocracy by which it was foreshadowed, went in his mind the conception also of a ministry exercising really *Divine functions*, of a proper priesthood, of *sacraments powerful to take away sin* and forward the soul in the way of everlasting life. Baptism, confirmation, *the mystical presence* of the holy eucharist, *the awful sacrifice of the altar*, penance, including confession and absolution, the sacrament of orders, consecrations, and holy rites generally, derived for him their significance and force from this article of *the holy Catholic church*. *Here only* THE BIBLE could have *its right authority and proper use*. Here only any virtue could have true Christian merit. The idea of the church determined the view taken of heresy and schism. We have seen how it carried the sense

of the communion of saints beyond the grave also, leading NATURALLY to sacrifices and prayers for the dead, and encouraging the belief that THE SAINTS IN HEAVEN MAKE INTERCESSION for their brethren who are still in the world. The veneration of relics, which we find in the church from the earliest times, must be referred to the same general sentiment. All these conceptions belong predominantly, we may say, to one general side of the system before us."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 545, 546.

He thus represents a belief in the intervention of the saints in heaven in behalf of those who are still in the world, and a reliance on their intercessions, as an integral part of the great system of doctrines and rites he here enumerates, which were the distinguishing features of the Catholic religion, from the fourth century to the Reformation, and which he maintains were at every point of that period the genuine doctrines and rites of Christianity, and constituted its very essence and being.

Dr. Nevin and his coadjutors, of course, regard them still as essential elements of the Christian system. They are of necessity such, and must ever continue to be, on their theory of development and transmission; according to which, Christianity always continues "true to its original nature;" never develops anything that was not "originally present in it," and never rejects anything which it develops; but whatever is unfolded at any stage of its history, "must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element" in it "in the subsequent part of the process." If they were ever, indeed, the genuine and most essential elements of Christianity, it is absurd and solecistical in the highest degree to suppose that they can have lost that character, passed to the antipodes, and become a superlatively false and apostate system. If, as Dr. N. and his compeers hold, the fact, that these doctrines were held by the Catholic and Romish church through a long series of ages, is a proof that they were the genuine and characteristic doctrines of Christianity at every stage of that period; is not the fact that they are now equally held to be the very soul and substance of Christianity by the Papal and Greek churches, which far outnumber the Protestant, as ample proof that they are now the genuine and essential elements of the Christian system? If baptism was originally made the sole

medium of the regenerating influence; if its investiture with that high function, had its ground in the very nature of redemption; and if it continued to hold it for fifteen centuries; is there any reason to believe that it is not still, and as absolutely as ever, the sacrament of regeneration? Has any change taken place in the nature of man, in the prerogatives of the ministry, or in the principle of the divine procedure, that can necessarily or naturally have divested the rite of that high office, and reduced it to the rank of a mere outward sign? If there was any such inadequacy in Christ's expiation as to render an atonement by the eucharist essential, in order to the pardon of believers in former ages, is there any reason to suppose that an expiation by the mass is not equally indispensable to the complete forgiveness and redemption of men at the present day? If Christ's intercessions were unequal to the necessities of the church through the first fifteen centuries of her existence, and thousands and myriads of departed saints were invested with the office of mediators to supply his inadequacy, is there any reason to believe that their intervention is not still equally necessary, and the propriety and duty of relying on it as imperative as it ever was? Has man become less lost than he once was, or God more placable, so that intercessions are less necessary than they once were to the suppliant's obtaining spiritual and temporal blessings? The supposition that such a stupendous change has taken place in the divine administration in whatever relation it is contemplated, is infinitely contradictory to the attributes of God and the doctrines of his word. No man in his senses can believe it. No one can persuade himself that it is believed by Dr. N. and his party. All the considerations which they allege as evincing that those were the genuine doctrines and the very substance of Christianity for a long tract of ages, show equally that they still retain that character. If the fact that they were held by the Romish church through such a series of centuries is a proof, as Dr. N. and his coadjutors aver, that they were then the genuine form and the vital substance of Christianity; is not the fact that they are held in precisely the same relation by the present Papal church, which is far more numerous and authoritative than it was in the dark ages, an equal proof that they are still the true form and the vital essence of the Christian

religion? They are now, unquestionably, in a state of development, as complete, as authoritative, and as exclusive of all contradictory doctrines as they ever were. If their very existence in the ancient church gave them, as these writers maintain, the stamp of divinity; if, according to their pantheistic theory, they were in their evolution and subsistence "a revelation of God, and an authoritative manifestation of his will," then they must in their evolution and subsistence in the present Romish church be equally a revelation of him, and an equally authoritative expression of his will. The fact that they are not held by the Protestant churches, is, on their theory, no evidence that they are not the doctrines of Christianity. It only shows that the time has not yet come for their development there. It is no proof that they will not hereafter gain an entrance into the Protestant creed. So far from it, that is expected by Dr. Nevin and his party, and is regarded as the glorious consummation in which the great process of development is to terminate. Thus Dr. N. says of Protestantism:—

"The fashion of this system passeth away. We can have no rational faith in it then, *as an abiding order*, but only as we take it for a *transitory* scheme, whose breaking up is to make room in due time for another and far more perfect state of the church, in which its disorders and miseries shall finally be brought to an end. But to feel this, with any sense of the historical rights of the ancient church, and with any apprehension of what the Roman communion still is, as distinguished from the Protestant, is to see and feel at the same time that the new order in which Protestantism is to become thus complete, cannot be reached without *the co-operation and help of Romanism*. However faulty this may be in its separate character, it still embodies in itself, nevertheless, *CERTAIN PRINCIPLES and FORMS OF LIFE, derived from the past history of the church*, which are wanting to Protestantism as it now stands, and which need to be incorporated with it in some way *as the proper and necessary complement of its own nature*. The interest of Romanism is not so left behind, as to be no longer of any account. It must come in hereafter to counterbalance and arrest again the disorder and excess of the other system. To this issue it comes necessarily, we say, with *the historical scheme* now under consideration."—*Review*, 1852, pp. 48, 49.

The "*principles and forms of life*" of Romanism which

Protestantism is expected thus to incorporate with itself, are of course the doctrines, forms of worship, and other religious observances of the Catholic church which it now rejects; and thence the doctrines of which these writers have been treating, and the rejection of which, as false and apostate, they regard as a fatal error of Protestants;—namely, the supreme authority of tradition, baptismal regeneration, expiation by the mass, the invocation of saints, the homage of relics and images, and the other great elements of the Romish superstition, which Dr. N. and his co-operators are endeavoring to retrieve from the discredit into which they have fallen with Protestants, and reinstate in the rank they have so long enjoyed in the Catholic church of essential and imperishable elements of the Christian system. To suppose they are anything else, is to suppose that these writers are contending for what, after all, they believe—so far as the Protestant communion is concerned—has for ever perished; and for what, moreover, is not to be essential to the perfection to which that branch of the church is finally to attain; which is to convert the effort in which they have expended so much labor and zeal, into an absurd and senseless farce.

To suppose, moreover, that they do not regard them as still the genuine doctrines of Christianity and as obligatory on the church as any others, but reject them as having become obsolete and false, is to suppose that their estimate of them is, after all, essentially the same as that of the Protestants and Puritans whom they reproach and denounce so passionately for discarding them. And is that credible? After all the din and clamor they have kept up in respect to them for eight or ten years, do they in fact attach no practical importance to them? Notwithstanding the lofty eulogies they have bestowed on their theory of development as indicating the only way in which Christianity can have a present existence, and the assurance a thousand times repeated, that, according to that theory, they are its most essential and imperishable elements, do they yet in reality regard them as having lost their truth and significance, and passed away like the abrogated rites and ceremonies of a former dispensation? After all their reproaches and denunciations of Puritanism for the rejection of this system, do

they themselves in fact as truly discard and disown it as effete, worthless, and apostate, and neither expect nor desire that it should ever regain a place in the Protestant church? And has all the noise they have made, the vast concern they have expressed at the errors of Protestantism, the boasts in which they have indulged of their superior knowledge, and the jeers and scoffs they have heaped on Puritanism, been but an empty flourish, got up to give vent to their superfluous perspicacity and learning, and excite the gaze and wonder of the church? Such must be the fact, unless they truly regard these doctrines as still the genuine and essential doctrines of Christianity, as binding on the church and as indispensable to an acceptable faith and worship as it is supposed they were in the ages anterior to the Reformation. But no one will believe it is so. To suppose it, would imply that they are the subjects of a worse lapse from integrity, and a more debasing hallucination, than their most heated assailants have ever ascribed to them.

No man can for a moment believe that that is the position they occupy. As they are not demented, but act with an intelligent aim, are aware of the import of their procedure, and are earnest and determined in pursuing it,—they regard these doctrines as the true and unalterable constituents of the Christian system, and absolutely essential to a pure faith and a perfect worship; and it is this conviction, considered, according to their pantheistic theory, as a direct revelation of God, and manifestation of his will, that has developed and worked itself out in their long, laborious, and zealous discussions on the subject; and their desire and endeavor is to bring the Protestant church to adopt them, and unite herself again to the apostate communion of Rome.

So much for the *proofs* that a combination of persons "has risen in the German Reformed church, who favor the doctrines of Romanism, exalt the authority of tradition above the Scriptures, look to sacraments for the atonement of sin and the regeneration of the heart, and rely on the intercession of saints for other spiritual and temporal blessings." Our readers can now judge what estimate is to be formed of the Editor of the "*Messenger*," who pronounces this statement "a sheer fabrication from beginning to end, . . . a most unqualified untruth," and "a foul slander," and wonders

that "the hand that penned it," had not been instantly blasted by "the lightnings of heaven." What a sublime exhibition of the genius of pantheism! *Tantum animis celestibus iræ?* What a beautiful exemplification of that intuitional power of which it boasts, that piercing through the mists and veils that obstruct the senses, has a direct vision of the Absolute, and without the aid of means, discerns and grasps all spiritual truth! What guilelessness and candor! What gentleness and meekness!

ART. V.—CRITICS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

I.

THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY YEARS.

OUR space only allows us to state, in answer to the inquiries of a Correspondent, that the Twelve Hundred and Sixty Years denoted by the times, time, and half a time, Dan. vii. 25, began, we have reason to believe, about the close of the sixth, or opening of the seventh century. That symbol is the measure of the period during which the Papal power denoted by the little horn, was to have the saints of the Most High in its hand, and to wear them out. And they were given into its hand by the nationalization of the Papal hierarchies in the ten kingdoms of the Western Roman empire, by which the decrees of the Popes and Councils were legalized, and penalties denounced and inflicted by the State on all who rejected the authority of the church, or refused to unite in its worship. The church of Italy was nationalized by the Lombards in 591, and that of Kent, England, in 598, 599, or at the latest, it would seem, in 600; as in 601. Augustine, who had been appointed archbishop, held a council in which he claimed authority over all the ancient churches of the Britons, and threatened to enforce obedience to the

Romish church by the sword of the monarchs; and Ethelbert himself, in 605, denounced excommunication and eternal death on all who should violate the provisions of the charter by which he instituted and endowed a monastery at Canterbury. Whether then the Twelve Hundred and Sixty Years had their commencement at the investiture of the Papal hierarchies with absolute power over those who bore the Christian name in the ten kingdoms, or with the direct exercise of that power in enforcing obedience by civil penalties, they are to be dated undoubtedly at or near the beginning of the seventh century.

II.

THE END OF THE SECOND WOE.

To the inquiry of a correspondent on this subject, we answer, that the conquest and occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, may not necessarily involve the dissolution of the Turkish empire. As that empire subsisted in Asia Minor for more than a century before Constantinople was captured and made the residence of the Sultans; so it may happen that the immediate effect of its fall into the hands of the Russians, may be simply the transference of the Turkish court to an eastern city, Smyrna, Antioch, or Damascus, and a fresh struggle to maintain the empire in that form.

ART. VI.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER, AND THE EPISTLES OF JOHN AND JUDE. Translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version. Printed by Holman & Gray for the American Bible Union. 1852.

THE American Bible Union have, as a preliminary to "the revision of the English New Testament," which they contemplate, engaged a number of scholars, without consideration whether they belong to the Baptist denomination or not, to furnish a translation from the Greek of its several parts, which are distributed among them, with critical notes, as an auxiliary to "the Revisors" who are finally to decide

what the form shall be of the new version. Rules are given for the direction of the translators, the principal of which are, that,

"The exact meaning of the inspired text, as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were first written, must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, so far as they can be found, with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness.

"The version in common use shall be made the basis of revision, all unnecessary interference with the established phraseology shall be avoided, and only such alterations be made as the exact meaning of the inspired text and the existing state of the language may require.

"Translations or revisions of the New Testament shall be made from the received Greek text, critically edited, with known errors corrected.

"The common English version must be made the basis of the revision of the English New Testament.

"Whenever an alteration from that version is made on any authority additional to that of the revisor, such authority must be cited in the manuscript.

"Every Greek word or phrase, in the translation of which the phraseology of the common version is changed, must be carefully examined in every other place in which it occurs in the New Testament, and the views of the revisor given of its proper translation in each place."

The translations and notes in this volume, "by one of the scholars employed by the Union," are framed in conformity with these rules, and are the work of one manifestly well qualified by learning, industry, and judgment, for the task. It will compare favorably either in respect to critical skill or acquaintance with authorities, with any work on the New Testament that has appeared in our country.

The page, which is quarto, presents, in parallel columns, the common version, the Greek text, and the new translation; and below, occupying usually half the space, the notes, in which critical observations are made on the text, reasons are given for what is peculiar or new in the translation, and authorities are cited. These, besides the most important ancient and modern versions, comprise a great number of Greek, Latin, German, French, English, and other commentators most in repute, and present, on many passages, a very imposing array.

The new translation does not exhibit many important deviations from the common version. The following portion of the first chapter of 2 Peter, v. 15-20, may be taken as a specimen:—

"15. But I will also endeavor that ye may be able always after my decease to call these things to mind. 16. For it was not from having followed cunningly-devised fables *that* we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but from having been eye witnesses of his majesty. 17. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there was borne to him such a voice from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. 18. And this voice we heard borne from heaven, being with him on the holy mount. 19. And we have the prophetic word more sure, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; 20. Knowing this first that no prophecy of Scripture cometh of private interpretation. 21. For not by man's will was prophecy brought at any time, but the holy men of God spake as moved by the Holy Spirit."

Translations are to be furnished, we learn, by the same hand, of the First Epistle of Peter, of the two Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, and of the Apocalypse. They will form, when completed, a very valuable contribution to our Biblical literature.

2. CONSOLATION; or Discourses on Select Topics. Addressed to the Suffering People of God. By James W. Alexander, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1853.

THE consolation here presented to afflicted believers is founded on the perfections, the sway, and the word of the Almighty. Their faith, their hope, and their peace, under the sorrows with which they are stricken, are to repose on his infinite attributes, his all-directing providence, and the assurances he has given that the chastenings with which he visits his people, are assigned them for wise and gracious purposes, and are to issue in their redemption. Their calmness, serenity, and joy, therefore, should rise to a greatness and sublimity in some measure proportional to the basis on which they rest. These are the topics, accordingly, the omnipotence, the omniscience, the wisdom, the goodness, the mercy, the providence, the promises of God, the compassion of Christ, the strength with which he sustains believers, and other kindred themes, that are presented by Dr. Alexander, and they are treated in a very happy manner. It is not a volume of common-places, but is marked throughout with the freshness and vigor of an original thinker. The style is eminently simple and vivacious, and the thoughts gushing directly from the intellect and heart, and winged often by a bold and graceful fancy, waft the reader above the storms and darkness that invest him here, into the realms of unclouded day, of undisturbed repose.

3. CONVERSATIONS on the Present Age of the World in connexion with Prophecy. Albany: J. Munsell. 1853.

THIS work, which is in the form of a dialogue, is designed first to remove the prejudice that generally prevails against the study of the prophecies, from the impression that they are unintelligible; and next, to indicate the accomplishment, in the present state of the world, of many of the predictions that are to have their fulfilment immediately before the overthrow of the antichristian powers. In respect to the first, the author shows that the figures and symbols of the prophecies, instead of being inexplicable, are founded on analogies with which all are familiar; and that precisely the same or similar objects are used every day in speech, and in oratory and poetry, for the purpose of comparison or representation. A civil revolution like that of France in 1848, for example, is called an earthquake; a high political or social agitation, a tempest; a conjunction of great mercantile revulsions and catastrophes, a commercial whirlwind. After pointing out the resemblance which subsists between the metaphors and symbols of the Scriptures and the figures of common life, he proceeds to combat the false notion very generally entertained that the nations are to be converted by the means now employed by the church for the purpose, and that the millennium is to precede the advent of Christ; and to show that instead, the antichristian powers are to maintain their supremacy till he comes and destroys them; and that in the mean time the nations are to be scourged by great calamities; that worldliness, lawlessness, delusion, infidelity, and evil in all its forms are to prevail on an unexampled scale, and that the truth and its friends are to be forced to struggle to maintain their place. The endeavor in which the civil and ecclesiastical powers on the continent of Europe are now engaged to extinguish political and religious liberty, he holds is to be successful; the Papists are to repossess themselves of Great Britain; the persecution and slaughter of the witnesses are soon to follow; and then in quick succession the effusion of the seventh vial, great political commotions and revolutions throughout the world, the fall and annihilation of Babylon; and at length the advent of the Redeemer, the destruction of the antichristian powers, the resurrection of the holy dead, and the institution of the millennial kingdom, when all nations are to become subject to Christ's sceptre, and the earth be filled with righteousness and peace.

We differ from the writer on a number of topics: but his views in the main are undoubtedly correct; and they are presented in a manner that is highly adapted to interest and aid plain and serious readers, for whom the volume is especially designed, and extricate

them from the mischievous persuasion to which they have been led by false teaching, that the prophetic Scriptures lie wholly beyond the sphere of their comprehension. The events of the last sixty years undoubtedly present as exact and palpable a parallel to the predictions under the first six vials, as the capture of Babylon by Cyrus formed to the predictions of that event.

4. *THE VOYAGE OF LIFE.* By J. B. Waterbury, D.D.

A WORK suggested to the author by Cole's celebrated allegorical paintings, and written for the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, It is, of course, especially adapted to the young, but may be read with interest, and not without profit, by all—abounding as it does in just views and wise counsels in relation to the successive stages of human life. Parents may be instructed by it, and youth admonished; manhood nerved for its duties, and age comforted under its trials. An additional interest is imparted to the volume by a series of engravings which serve at once to arrest attention and predispose to serious thought; while the manner in which the author has unfolded their significance, evinces a cultivated taste as well as a deep interest in the spiritual welfare of every voyager on the sea of life.

R. W. D.

5. *OUTLINES OF ASTRONOMY,* by Sir John F. W. Herschel, Bart., K.H., a new edition, with numerous plates and wood-cuts. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. 1852.

THIS volume presents not only a general description of the orbs that belong to our Solar System and the stars, with the phenomena which they exhibit, but of the methods also by which our knowledge of them is obtained, and the various problems they suggest are solved. After the introductory chapters, in which the principal astronomical instruments are described, and a general view given of the structure of the universe, the author treats minutely of the several bodies that belong to our system, of the stars that are seen in our sky, and of the groups of more distant worlds, and furnishes all the information that is of interest to readers generally, on almost every topic throughout the wide circle of the science; and with a clearness that renders the perusal of the volume easy and delightful in an unusual degree. The chapters on the fixed stars and nebulae are especially attractive.

6. **THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN**, expounded for those who search the Scriptures, by E. W. Hengstenberg, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, Author of *Typology of Scripture*. Volume second. New York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1853.

THIS volume, which completes the work, is marked by the same characteristics as the former,—indicating an intimate acquaintance with the ancient Scriptures, confuting many false constructions that have been put on the symbols, and presenting many just and important thoughts; yet in the main, missing the true significance of the prophecy, and exhibiting it as nothing more than a vague and shadowy representative of the general features of the Pagan and Christianized nations, of the supports with which God sustains his children, and of the judgments with which he smites and destroys his enemies. The beast of seven heads and ten horns, instead of denoting the rulers of the Roman empire, according to him, is only a symbol of the ungodly power of the world generally, from the Egyptian empire to the last form of the Roman; and represents the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek monarchies, as much as the supreme rulers of Rome. The sixth head he regards as the Roman power under the emperors of John's time, and holds that it was that head that received the deadly wound; and that the stroke by which it was produced was inflicted by Christ's atonement! The second beast, instead of symbolizing the Papal power in its two forms, civil and ecclesiastical, represents, according to him, "the God-opposing" wisdom of the world, and especially in the form of "the false ungodly teaching" of Pagan priests and philosophers. That it has any special reference to the apostate teachers of the Roman church, he emphatically and zealously denies. Babylon the great stands, he holds, for heathen Rome, as a city or capital. The first resurrection is not a resurrection, either literal or spiritual, but only the state of blessedness into which the martyrs and other believers passed immediately after death; and those who sat on thrones were the apostles and other believers who died and entered into rest during the triumphant reign of the beast. The thousand years of their reign are accordingly now passed, and the present period is the period of Satan's release from imprisonment, and renewed deception of the heathen nations! Such are the constructions he puts on some of the most important symbols. He reveals a strong sympathy with the Papal church, not only by denying that her hierarchy is represented by either of the symbols of the anti-christian ecclesiastical powers—the beast from the earth, the image, Babylon, or the false prophet—but by directly indicating

his belief in her doctrine of purgatory. We hope on a future occasion to give a fuller view of his work.

7. **A HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITISH NATION.** From their Origin to their Dispersion, at the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. By Archibald Alexander, D.D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1853.

THIS volume, marked by the simple style, the clear thought, and the Christian sentiments that are characteristic of its author, is excellently adapted to engage and instruct the reader, whatever may be the class to which he belongs, and particularly the young, for whom it is especially designed. The chapters are not made up of dry details, or disconnected incidents, but all the great events in the history of our race, from Adam to Abraham, and of the Hebrews, from Abraham to the fall of Jerusalem, are wrought into a rapid and graceful narrative, and interspersed often with practical thoughts and utterances of feeling of which Dr. Alexander's genius was eminently prolific, that shed life and grace over the page. The history of other ancient nations has but few attractions compared to that of the Hebrews. None records such a series of great and wonderful events; none presents such a picture of human nature, either in its purest or its most perverted forms; and it has the still more emphatic distinction that it alone contains the history of God's intercourse with our race; records the communications he has made to us of his will; unfolds the great principles of the government he is now exercising over us; and lifting the veil from the future, reveals to us that unending existence to which we are advancing.

8. **THE PREACHER AND THE KING; or, Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV.** Translated from the French of L. Bungener. With an Introduction, by George Potts, D.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1853.

WE have had various works respecting Louis XIV., and each in turn has served to reflect some light on his character and reign; but this is the first that has presented him to our view in his relation to the pulpit. Unhappily for him as well as his courtiers, the pulpit, though embodying an extraordinary degree of talent, was unduly swayed by a regard for his approbation; and hence, whoever was called to preach in his presence, not unfrequently complimented him on his greatness and goodness, at the expense of truth and duty.

It appears that Bourdaloue had received an anonymous letter which exposed the true character of one of his own panegyrical per-

orations before the king; and after some two years, he is surprised by a visit from the unknown writer of the letter, and by him detected in appending the same fulsome eulogy to the sermon which he has just written to preach on the last day of Lent—a day, which, owing to a combination of events in the king's household, would at once require and justify the plainest and most faithful dealing with the royal conscience.

Bourdaloue has seen his error—has bowed his head in shame and grief—means to do what in his soul he now feels to be his duty; but woe to him who ventures to thwart the king's wishes! And will the preacher hazard the royal frown? May not his courage at last fail, though conscience is now goading him on to be faithful in the discharge of his high and solemn trust?

On this turns the whole dramatic interest of the work which Dr. Potts, at the request of the anonymous translator, has, in some appropriate remarks, introduced to the public. It has consequently much of the interest of a work of fiction, though the characters represented are life-like portraits of historical men, the events referred to susceptible of proof, and the sentiments embodied such as may be gathered from the writings of the period embraced in the narrative, and may, therefore, be read with pleasure in this beautiful translation; and with benefit, since it affords a very definite idea of the preaching of those times, and suggests various important thoughts on the subject of sacred eloquence.

Had we not been so informed, we might have supposed that it was written by some member of the Reformed church in France. No Romanist would have introduced Claude under such favorable circumstances, or suffered him to appear to so great advantage as he does, in "the second council of the philosophers." Nor is it surprising that a work which evinces more than ordinary dramatic talent should have already reached its thirteenth edition in the French language. And it will be appreciated in its English dress, especially by all who take an interest in whatever pertains to literary criticism and sacred rhetoric.

R. W. D.

9. **AMERICAN MISSIONARY MEMORIAL**, including Biographical and Historical Sketches. Edited by H. W. Pierson, A.M. With numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853.

THIS is a very tasteful tribute to the memory of some of the most distinguished of the missionaries who have gone from our country to make known the gospel to the heathen in Asia and Africa, and have passed from their labors to the skies. No other class has furnished

so large a share, during the century, of materials for interesting biographies, or furnished proportionally so many signal examples of eminent piety, heroic courage, and distinguished usefulness. The self-denials, the toils, the uncertainties, the sorrows, and the dangers of a missionary life, are adapted to unfold the principles and affections in unusual strength, and to lead to a direct and habitual realization of the great truths of Christianity, and a sense of dependence on God, trust in him, submission to him, and a desire for his kingdom; and these traits appear in bold relief in the delineations that are here traced. They are written with good taste, the characters are well drawn, and they form together a noble group. A more striking contrast than the genius, piety, faith, self-denial, love, laboriousness, patience, fidelity, usefulness, and victory in death of these disciples of Christ, form to the apostles and disciples of infidelity of the same period, cannot be imagined. The splendors of noonday do not more outdazzle the darkness of midnight. They present an impressive contrast also to the religious agitators and demagogues at home, who, with vast professions of piety, endeavor to make the benevolent institutions of the church the instruments of their party purposes, and instead of teaching, employ themselves in assailing the great doctrines of the gospel, and raising up a band of disciples to propagate their false systems in its place.

10. ON THE LESSONS IN PROVERBS; being the Substance of Lectures delivered to Young Men's Societies at Portsmouth and elsewhere.
By Richard C. Trench, D.D. Redfield. 1853.

ONE would scarcely have thought that wits and critics would have found it difficult to give a satisfactory definition of a proverb. Yet hitherto, according to Mr. Trench, it has quite baffled their powers. He does not even attempt it, but contents himself with pointing out what he regards as its essential requisites,—brevity, sense, wit, and popularity,—which, however, are not distinctive characteristics of proverbs, but are common to all pithy sentences. Martial's "happy epigram upon epigrams," is not a definition, but only an enumeration of certain qualities which they should possess, and is equally applicable to proverbs.

*Omne epigramma sit instar apis; sit aculeus illi,
Sint sua mella; sit et corporis exigui.*

Let epigrams be fashioned like a bee.
Give them a sting. With honey freight them fresh
Sucked from the flowers; and alight in form and terse
Let them disport upon an airy wing.

But though he has not given a direct statement of his subject, he has made a highly entertaining and instructive volume on the form and generation of Proverbs, their cast in different nations, their poetry, wit, and wisdom, and their morality and theology. A proverb is a brief sentence in which some characteristic of a person, thing, or mode of agency, is expressed in a terse and pointed manner, so as to serve as a maxim: As, "haste makes waste;" "a rolling stone gathers no moss." They are often mere comparisons; as Solomon's, "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." They are often metaphors; as "Wisdom is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her." They are still more frequently hypocatastases; as, "He is burning his fingers to snuff another man's candle;" in which an act of one kind is used to represent another; and, "He howls with the wolves instead of bleating with the sheep;" that is, instead of suffering with the innocent, he joins the unjust and merciless in assailing and destroying them. Mr. Trench gives many fine examples, traces a number through the various forms they bear in different languages, and furnishes his readers with a rich fund of instructive and amusing thought.

11. THE GREAT APOSTASY, a Sermon on Romanism, preached by appointment, and published by request of the Synod of Virginia, by George Junkin, D.D. Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1853.

THIS is a clear and effective statement of proofs that the Papal is an apostate church, and the church especially denoted by the Babylon of the Apocalypse, the symbol of the great usurping, idolatrous, and persecuting ecclesiastical power. We are glad to see it published under auspices and in a form that secure to it a wide circulation. It cannot be too extensively disseminated and read. It is noticeable that events are occurring from time to time that strongly call the attention of Protestants to this subject. The evangelical churches are now far better aware of the character of Romanism, than they were anterior to the rise and spread of Puseyism. The persecution of Protestants a few years ago in Madeira, and at the present time in Tuscany, has roused the public here and in Great Britain to a far deeper realization than it before had, that the Catholic hierarchies are still animated by the same intolerance, ambition, and cruelty, as they were in the dark ages; and, were they possessed of the requisite power, would instantly strike to the grave all those who oppose their sway. By thus reminding them of the errors against which they are to contend, and the danger and death to which their fidelity is to expose them. God is gradually preparing his people for the conflict that is approaching.

INDEX.

A.

Age of the earth, geological theories of, 1-74.
 Alexander, A., on moral science, 624; History of Israelites, 695.
 Alexander, J. W., Discourses, 691.
 American Bible Union Translations, 689.
 American Missionary Memorial, 696.
 Answers to Geologists, 292-312.
 Apocalypse, Wordsworth's Lectures, 423-461.
 Apostasy of Rome, G. Junkin, 698.
 Astronomy, Herschel's Outlines of, 693.

B.

Barnes, A., notes on Revelation, 150-169; 316-344.
 Bourdaloue; or, the Court of Louis XIV., 695.
 Bridgman, E. J. G., Daughters of China, 528.

C.

Calvin's Life and Times, Henry's, 529-588.
 Carson, A., on inspiration, 524; on providence, 528.
 Charges, bishop Potter's, 352.
 Christianity, Coleman's Ancient, 527.
 China, Daughters of, Bridgman's, 528.
 Clark, S. D., on Truth, 241-275.
 Conversations on Prophecy, 692.
 Cousin, V., history of philosophy, 344.
 Critics and Correspondents, 292-312; 688.

D.

Days, the Twelve Hundred and Sixty, 688.
 Dickinson, R. W., on the Scriptures, 403-422; Life and Times of Calvin, 529-588.
 Doctrines of Dr. Nevin and his party, 656-688.
 Duffield, G., on the knowledge of God, 79-94.

E.

Egypt, J. Kenrick's, 526.
 English Universities, 613-635.
 Epistle, second of Peter, and epistles of John and Jude translated, 689.
 Evidences of Christianity, lectures on, 173.

F.

Figures of Isaiah, 74-79; 233-241; 461-469.
 Fowler, W. C., on English Universities, 613-635.
 Fulness of the Times, J. Forayth, Jun., 469-489.

G.

Geology, materials of the earth's crust, 177-233.
 Geologists, answers to their objections, 292-312.
 Geological Observer, Sir H. T. De La Beche's, 169.
 Geological theories of the structure and age of the world, 1-74: 353-408; 588-613.
 German Reformed Church, Romanizing party in, 636-688.
 God known only by faith, 79-94.
 Grammar, Latin, Zumpt's, 352.

DEC 10 1965

